

# AMERICAN JOURNAL OF PHILOLOGY.

---

VOL. II.

No. 6.

---

## I.—THE NEW REVISION OF KING JAMES' REVISION OF THE NEW TESTAMENT.

### I.

#### SOME ACCOUNT OF THE PREVIOUS ENGLISH VERSIONS AND REVISIONS AND OF THE STATE AND TREATMENT OF THE GREEK TEXT.

In the preparation of this paper the following works were chiefly consulted, and their statements are often given with the language unchanged: *History of the English Bible*, B. F. Westcott, D. D., 12mo, 2d ed., London, 1872; *The English Bible: a Critical History of the various English Translations*, John Eadie, D. D., 2 vols., 8vo, London, 1876; *Michaelis' Introduction to the New Testament, translated from the German with Notes, etc.*, Herbert Marsh, Bishop of Peterborough, 6 vols., 8vo, 4th ed., London, 1823; *Bibliotheca Sacra seu Syllabus omnium ferme S. S. Editionum ac Versionum Jacobi Le Long*, II Partes, 8vo, Parisiis, 1709; *An Introduction to the Criticism of the Old Testament*, John Ayre, M. A., 8vo, London, 1860; *The Printed Text of the Greek New Testament*, S. P. Tregelles, LL. D., 8vo, London, 1854; *An Introduction to the Criticism of the New Testament*, F. H. Scrivener, M. A., LL. D., 8vo, 2d ed., London, 1874.

For the first entire Bible in English we are indebted to John de Wycliffe, who was educated at the University of Oxford, and was Master of Balliol College in 1361. A certain sort of preparatory work, however, had in God's providence already been done. Caedmon embodied the historical part of the Scriptures in the alliterative metre of the Anglo-Saxon poetry; Aldhelm, Bishop of Sherborne, in the VIIth century translated the Psalter; the venerable Bede

translated the Gospel of St. John; Alfred the Great translated the four chapters of Exodus, xx-xxiii, as the basis of his laws, rendered portions of the Bible and some of the Psalms for the use of his own children; and a tradition exists, but only a tradition, that he translated the whole Bible. There is an Anglo-Saxon version of the Gospels interlinear with the Latin of the Vulgate, the Durham book, which is known to belong to the IXth or the Xth century; there is another of the same date in the Bodleian Library, called the Rushworth Gloss; there is another of somewhat later date in the Bodleian, and in Corpus Christi College, Cambridge; we have the famous Ormulum, a metrical paraphrase of the Gospels, which is assigned to the latter half of the XIIth century; there is a prose translation into Norman French of about 1260, as if meant for the higher classes and perhaps for the court itself; three separate versions of the Psalms, that portion of the Bible which has always been most dear to the English people, were made in these early days: one toward the close of the XIIIth century, a second by Schorham about 1320, and the third by Richard Rolle, Chantry priest of Hampole, about 1349. All these parts of the Bible were made from the Latin Vulgate as well as the entire Bible of Wycliffe. The New Testament of Wycliffe, the greater part of which seems to have been his personal work, was finished about 1382. The translation of the Old Testament was undertaken by his friend Nicholas de Hereford, Vice-Chancellor of Oxford, an excellent scholar, and carried as far as Baruch iii. 20, and the remainder is ascribed to Wycliffe, who died in 1384. Wycliffe's work was very close to the Latin, and, like the Latin itself, sometimes smooth and happy, and again rough and obscure; Hereford's work was still more literal and rough. The Wycliffite translation therefore needed revision to make it smooth and consistent, which was accomplished about 1388 by the careful and patient labor of John Purvey, the curate and intimate friend of Wycliffe. Purvey has given such an account of his method of revision as shows him to have been an exact scholar, and this method, carried further in the subsequent revisions, has given the English Bible some of its best characteristics. The New Testament proper of Wycliffe was printed by Lea Wilson in 1848, his Four Gospels by Bosworth and Waring in 1865, and at length in 1850, about 500 years after it was translated, the whole Bible, both in the translation and the revision, was printed at Oxford in 4 vols., 4to, edited by Forshall and Madden after a comparison of 170 MSS.,

on which they had bestowed the labor of twenty-two years. A reprint of the New Testament of this edition was made by the Clarendon Press in 12mo in 1879, under the care of Mr. Walter Skeat. The influence of the Wycliffite versions, as they are now designated, on the subsequent English Bibles is thought by some scholars to have been only traditional and indirect, and even the Rheims translators are supposed not to have used them. But there are many remarkable coincidences between these and all the subsequent versions as well as the Rheims, and the matter of their connection with Wycliffe still needs to be critically investigated. So much for the first MS. English Bible from the Latin.

The first printed English New Testament from the original Greek was a work accomplished by William Tyndale in 1525. For in the meantime the entire Greek New Testament had been printed, and the great honor of first doing this belongs to the illustrious Roman Cardinal, Francis Ximenes of Spain. He was educated at Alcala and Salamanca, and specially studied the Oriental languages and divinity in his retirement at Castanel. He enjoyed the favor of Queen Isabella of Castile, and was made Archbishop of Toledo in 1498; he devoted the large revenue of his see to the worthiest objects, one of his first acts being the establishment of the celebrated University of Alcala. In 1502 he projected the Polyglot Bible known as the *Complutensian*, from *Complutum*, the ancient name of Alcala, where it was printed. It is in 6 vols., folio, the 5th vol. containing the New Testament, in double columns of the Greek and the Vulgate Latin on each page, being completed Jan. 10, 1514. This portion is carefully printed, the practised eyes of Dr. Scrivener having detected only fifty errors of the press. The Greek type is round and bold, and not unlike that of the Florentine and Milan press of that period; the Latin is printed in an elegant Gothic character. The Cardinal himself directed the work, for the execution of which he gathered as many MSS. as he could procure, and invited the coöperation of learned men, as Alphonso, Coronel, and Zamisa, Jewish proselytes, for the Hebrew; and Lopez de Stunica, Antonio of Lebrixa, Ducas of Crete, and Ferdinand of Valladolid, for the Greek. The expense of the work, which was said to have been 50,000 ducats or about £23,000, was defrayed from the income of the Archbishop himself. The entire work, consisting of 600 copies, was printed by 1517. The editors of this edition of the New Testament do not describe the MSS. they used, and though the Cardinal in his dedication to Leo X. acknowledges

the loan of MSS. from the Vatican, yet the readings and the peculiarities of the forms of the words show that the MSS. used were of the Xth century downward, and there is no evidence that any MS. of high antiquity, as *Codex B* or *Vaticanus*, was employed. This text never came into general use, and has had but small influence on subsequent editions.

Though the New Testament was printed, as we have said, in 1514, the Pope's license for its publication was not granted till March 22, 1520. In the meantime another edition was *first published*. Froben, the printer of Bâle, having heard of the Cardinal's edition, wished to anticipate its appearance, and knowing that Erasmus, who was at that time in England, had paid attention to the Greek MSS., he proposed to him, April 17, 1515, to edit the Greek Testament without delay. He undertook it, and in six months, March 1, 1516, it was completed and immediately published: *praecipitatum fuit verius quam editum*, Erasmus himself says of it. This edition, as well as his others that followed, was in folio and very handsomely printed. It contained Erasmus' revision of the Latin Vulgate standing by the Greek in a parallel column, and also his annotations. Oecolampadius, afterward somewhat famous as a Lutheran, read the proof-sheets, but Froben's hot haste allowed him to do this office only very imperfectly. The MSS. which Erasmus used are still at Bâle, but with a single exception they were neither ancient nor particularly valuable. His *Codex Apoc.* 1 being mutilated in the last six verses, Erasmus himself turned these into Greek from the Vulgate, and some portions of his translation thus made still cleave to our *received text*. In 1518-19 (the edition bears both dates) he published more leisurely his second edition, correcting many of the misprints and amending not a few readings. In 1522, in exceedingly handsome style, he put forth his third edition, famous as the first one in which he consented to introduce the text of the Three Heavenly Witnesses, which he did from a Dublin MS. of the XVIth century, and which had previously appeared in the Complutensian as a translation from the Vulgate, which Stunica, one of the editors of the Complutensian, virtually confessed. In this third edition Erasmus made many improvements. In March 1527 he published his fourth edition with the text in three parallel columns, the Greek, the Latin Vulgate, and his own revision of it. He had now for the first time seen the Complutensian, and availed himself of its aid to improve his own work, especially in the Apocalypse. In 1535, the year before his



death at Bâle, he published his fifth edition, omitting the Latin Vulgate and making only slight changes in the Greek text. This work of Erasmus was the basis of many editions that followed. We pass over the *Graeca Biblia*, folio, 1518, Venice, from the celebrated press of Aldus, which professes to be grounded on ancient MSS. In this volume the LXX. appeared for the first time, but in the New Testament Aldus seems to follow the first edition of Erasmus even to the *errata*; and if any MSS. were consulted, we do not know what they were nor how they were employed.

It had now become possible to have a Bible founded on the Hebrew of the Old Testament and on the Greek of the New. In 1488 the Hebrew Bible entire had been first printed at Socino in Italy, where Hebrew was indeed cultivated, but Germany was rather considered as its home. The Hebrew could thus be used directly, and also indirectly through the close Latin version of Pagninus (4to, Lyons, 1527-28), and the freer translation of Münster (folio, Bâle, 1534-35). The knowledge of Greek, which was brought to Italy by Lascaris and other refugees from Constantinople at about this period, spread through Europe. It was pursued in Spain at the University of Alcalá about 1500; at Louvain in France about 1526; at Oxford in 1519; and at the same period in Germany and with great enthusiasm. In 1522 appeared Luther's New Testament from the Greek, and in 1534 his Old Testament from the Hebrew. In 1522, but before he could have heard of Luther's version, William Tyndale, who had been educated at the University of Oxford, had formed his purpose of translating the New Testament from the original. This he was compelled to undertake abroad, and when it was done he printed it at Cologne in 1525. He was, as is proved by his New Testament and portions of the Old, a competent Greek and Hebrew scholar. In making his version of the New Testament he rendered the Greek directly, with the help of the Vulgate, of the Latin revision of Erasmus, and of the German of Luther. He revised his work carefully in 1534 and again in 1535, making many important improvements as well as some very minute alterations that attest his scrupulous fidelity. He was engaged on this work while Luther was completing his own great labors in the same field. Tyndale was profoundly influenced by the great Reformer, and perhaps had personal intercourse with him at this period; for Sir Thomas More asserted, though without foundation, that Tyndale's work was a translation of Luther's. Of

the Old Testament he had translated the Pentateuch, which was published in 1531, and to the edition of the New Testament of 1534 he appended the Epistles from the Old Testament, beside which he did the book of Jonah, making about one-half of the Old Testament rendered by his own hand. So faithfully and learnedly was all this work done, that a true description of the forms of the English Bible since, is that they are revisions based on Tyndale's translation.

Miles Coverdale, born in Yorkshire, being fond of study, became attached to the Augustine Convent at Cambridge. He was admitted to priest's orders in 1514. He adopted the reformed views, but though he enjoyed the protection of Crumwell, the Prime Minister, he became alarmed for his own safety and fled to the Continent, where he may have met with Tyndale. Coverdale finished what Tyndale had begun. His translation and revision was made partly from the Hebrew and partly from the Zurich Bibles of 1524-29-39 and the Latin version of Pagninus; he also made use of Luther's translation and of the Vulgate. He himself describes his work as *faithfully translated out of Latin and Dutch* (German). Passing over Matthew's Bible, so-called, of 1537, which reprinted from Tyndale, with slight variations, the New Testament and the Pentateuch; from Coverdale, Ezra to Malachi and the Apocrypha; and from unknown sources in a new translation, the remaining books of the Old Testament from Joshua to 2d Chronicles, we come to the Great Bible of 1539, April 1540, and Nov. 1540, so designated as distinguished by its size from Matthew's and Coverdale's which preceded it. This work was a revision of Matthew's by Coverdale, and although it is commonly called Cranmer's Bible, yet the first of these three editions is properly called Crumwell's, because he arranged for the preparation and publication of it, which took place in Paris; the second is properly called Cranmer's, who, being favorable to Crumwell's undertaking, brought out a new edition in London, to which he himself contributed a preface; the third is properly called Tunstall and Heath's, who made a nominal revision of it at the instance of King Henry VIII. In 1534-35, as was intimated above, Sebastian Münster, Professor of Hebrew at Bâle, published a generally accurate Latin translation of the Hebrew Bible with notes from Rabbinical commentaries. It was by the aid of this work that Coverdale revised Matthew's Old Testament. The revision of the New Testament was more independent, and based on a careful study of the Vulgate and on

Erasmus' revision of the same. It cannot be without interest to note here that when the Prayer Book of the Church of England was last revised, in 1662, it was ordered that the other Lessons should be taken from King James' version, but that the Psalter, which had been taken from the Great Bible, should remain. King James' Psalter is a more scholarly and correct translation, but Coverdale's is superior in idea and in tone.

We must now resume the history of the Greek text. Robert Stephens of Paris, perhaps the most illustrious of the learned printers, though he had incurred the enmity of the Doctors of the Sorbonne by his editions of the Latin Vulgate, was protected and patronized by Francis I. and his son Henry II. The royal press was furnished with type cast at the expense of the king, and scholars are familiar with the words *Typis Regiis* on his title-pages. He published the Greek Testament in 1546 and again in 1549 in 16mo in elegant style, and from the opening words of the preface of both, *O mirificam Regis nostri—liberalitatem*, they are called the *O Mirificam editions*. He makes no mention of the learned labors of Erasmus, but says that the Complutensian had been of service to him, and that he had used MSS. of the Imperial Library. Dr. Mill says that the edition of 1546 differs from that of 1549 in only 67 places. In 1550 he published his third or folio edition, celebrated for the sumptuous style in which it was executed, and this is the earliest ever printed with critical apparatus, the various readings referred to in the *O Mirificam* being entered here on the margin. In his preface he states that his text was formed on sixteen authorities; that is, the Complutensian and fifteen MSS., one of which must have been the celebrated *Codex D* or *Codex Bezae*. The critical part of this work was done by his son Henry. Dr. Mill says again that the folio edition differs from the smaller ones in 284 readings, chiefly to adopt the text of Erasmus' fifth edition. This edition, with as critical a character perhaps as it was reasonable to expect at that early period, became the basis of the ordinary editions that followed, and was even adopted in 1859 by Dr. Scrivener, one of the two greatest names in these studies in England in recent times, as the basis of his edition, with the various readings of Beza, the Elzevir, Lachmann, Tischendorf, and Tregelles; and this edition, it may be of interest to state, was in the hands of the British and American revisers while prosecuting the work just completed.

In 1551 Stephens published at Geneva, in 2 vols. sm. 4to, an edition celebrated as giving in the first instance the division of the text into verses as we now have it. This has become an exceedingly rare and costly book; and as it has been incorrectly described by one of our greatest scholars in his Commentaries, there is subjoined as good a *fac-simile* as the printer could conveniently make of a portion of the first page of St. Matthew. It was printed in three columns: on the left of the Greek is the Vulgate, and on the right Erasmus' revision of it. Three of the five verses of the page are here given.

V.		E.
EVANGELIUM secundum Matthæum.	<i>ΕΥΑΓΓΕΛΙΟΝ κατὰ Ματθαῖον.</i>	EVANGELIUM secundum Matthæum.
Liber generationis IESV Christi, filii David, filii Abraham.	<i>Βίβλος γενέσεως Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, υἱοῦ Δαβὶδ, υἱοῦ Ἀβραάμ.</i>	I Libergenerationis IESV Christi, filii David, filii Abraham.
Abraham genuit Isaac. Isaac autem genuit Iacob. Iacob autem genuit Iudam et fratres eius.	<i>Ἀβραὰμ ἐγέννησε τὸν Ἰσαάκ. Ἰσαάκ δὲ ἐγέννησε τὸν Ἰακώβ. Ἰακώβ δὲ ἐγέννησε τὸν Ἰούδαν καὶ τοὺς ἀδελφοὺς αὐτοῦ.</i>	2 ¶ Abraham genuit Isaac. Isaac autem genuit Iacob. Iacob autem genuit Iudam et fratres eius.
Iudas autem genuit Phares et Zaram de Thamar. Phares autem genuit Esron. Esron autem genuit Aram.	<i>Ἰούδας δὲ ἐγέννησεν τὸν Φαρῆς καὶ τὸν Ζαρὰ ἐκ τῆς Θάμαρ. Φαρῆς δὲ ἐγέννησε τὸν Ἑσρώμ. Ἑσρώμ δὲ ἐγέννησε τὸν Ἀράμ.</i>	3 ¶ Iudas autem genuit Phares et Zaram e Thamar. Phares autem genuit Esrom. Esrom autem genuit Aram.

Theodore Beza (Theodore de Bèze) resigned his ecclesiastical preferments in 1548 and retired to Geneva, where he had the chief place among the French Reformers on the death of Calvin in 1564. He published five editions of the Greek Testament (1559, 1565, 1582, 1589, 1598) with his own careful Latin version (first published

in 1556 with Stephens' text), the Latin Vulgate, and annotations. He was a better translator and commentator than critic, and it was in the former capacity that he exerted his great influence over the succeeding English versions. He neither sought new material for revising the text nor made much use of what he had at hand. He had two ancient and valuable MSS. in his own possession, the *Codex D* or *Bezae*, containing the Gospels and Acts in Greek and Latin, now in the Library of the University of Cambridge, and the *Codex Claromontanus* from Clermont (whence it is said to have been brought), now in the Royal Library at Paris, containing the Epistles of St. Paul also in Greek and Latin; the papers containing the collations of Henry Stephens referred to above; and Tremellius' Latin version (1569) of the Peshito Syriac (first printed 1555), the first instance in which an ancient version of the N. T. beside the Latin Vulgate contributed to form the Greek text.

The work of English revision now goes forward and produces the celebrated Genevan Bible. Under the influence of Calvin Geneva had become the seat of devoted Biblical students, and the results of their labors were made available for the revision of the English Bible by the exiles under the persecution of Queen Mary, as well as of the French which was completed in 1588, and for the production in 1607 of the Italian version of Diodati. Circumstances made it possible for the Presbyterians to make a revision with great freedom, and the danger was that it would be the Bible of a party. But for the O. T. they took the Great Bible (probably the edition of 1550) as their basis and simply corrected the text; they did not make a new translation. In their changes in the O. T. they seem chiefly to have followed the Latin translation of Pagninus and Münster. In the N. T. they took for their basis Tyndale as given in Matthew's Bible, and in revising it they scarcely did more than apply Beza's translation and commentary. In the interpretation of the text Beza was singularly clear-sighted, but in the criticism of the text he was rash; but the cases in which Beza has corrected the renderings of former translators are incomparably more numerous than those in which he has introduced incorrect readings, and his Latin version is far superior to those that had been made before, and so consequently are the Genevan revisions that followed it. The N. T. was published in 1557 with an introductory epistle by Calvin, and again greatly improved in the entire Bible in 1560. The attractiveness of the Genevan Bible was enhanced by a marginal commentary, far more complete than any yet provided for the English reader.



On the accession of Queen Elizabeth in 1558 the use of the Scriptures was again conceded to the people, and the Great Bible was allowed its place as the authorized Bible for ecclesiastical use; but the wide circulation of the Genevan Bible made the defects of the Great Bible known, and Archbishop Parker, who was friendly to Biblical studies, took measures for a revision of the old translation. This was about 1563-64. The whole Bible was sorted out into parts, and these were distributed among able Bishops and other learned men to correct and improve; and the work amid some difficulties went forward and appeared in a magnificent volume in 1568. It is not known by whom the whole revision was actually made, but the Archbishop, to secure greater care on the part of the revisers, had their initials placed at the end of the books. Some names, however, are passed over; but of the revisers who can be probably identified, eight were Bishops, and from them the work took its title, *the Bishops' Bible*. The execution of the work is very unequal, and the Greek scholarship of the revisers is superior to their Hebrew. In the Old Testament improvements were made chiefly from the Genevan, but also from Pagninus, Leo Juda and Castalio. We have spoken of Pagninus above. Leo Juda, who had contributed to the Zurich German Bible, labored for many years at a new and somewhat free Latin version of the O. T., which after his death in 1542 was completed by others; Gualther revised Erasmus' Latin N. T., and the whole Bible thus finished was published in 1544. Sebastian Castalio, Professor of Greek at Bâle, also translated the whole Bible into Latin, and carried this freedom to a far greater length, endeavoring to make the Hebrew and the Greek writers speak in pure and elegant Latinity. The new work of the revisers themselves can hardly be commended; for it was often arbitrary and inexact. The work on the New Testament was the more valuable. Among the revisers of this part was Lawrence, probably the head-master of Shrewsbury School, and famed for his knowledge of Greek, an excellent specimen of whose strictures on the old translation has come down to us. The changes made in the New Testament were partly from the Genevan version and partly the fruit of independent and exact scholarship. In 1572 a second edition of the Bishops' Bible was published, the Old Testament being unchanged and the New being carefully revised. The Genevan Bible still held its ground, but the Great Bible was speedily displaced by the Bishops', and the latter by order of King James was afterward made the basis of his revision. The

Bishops' Bible, like the Genevan, was accompanied with marginal notes or a commentary.

The wide circulation and great influence of the Reformed versions of the Bible made it impossible for the Roman Catholic scholars to withstand the demand for vernacular translations of the Scriptures, sanctioned by the authority of the Church of Rome. An English version formed part of that plan for winning back England to the Church of Rome which was formed by Cardinal Allen. The Cardinal established a seminary at Douai in France in 1568, and afterward transferred it temporarily to Rheims in 1578, and here the revision of the N. T. was finished in 1582, and hence took its name, *the Rhemish Testament*. It was made from the Vulgate; but the earlier English translations, especially the Genevan, were the groundwork of their version. The men who made it had great erudition; as, Gregory Martin, one of the original scholars of St. John's College, Oxford, and M. A. in 1564; Cardinal Allen, who had been a Canon of York, and Principal of St. Mary's Hall, Oxford, in the reign of Queen Mary; Richard Bristow, M. A., of Christ's Church, Oxford, and afterward fellow of Exeter College, who is said to have made the notes to the New Testament; and Thomas Worthington, who also had studied at Oxford, and who is said to have prepared the tables and annotations to the Old Testament. When the New Testament was published the entire version had been delayed for want of means, and in fact the Old Testament did not appear till 1609-10 in 2 vols. 4to, at Douai, and hence the entire work is commonly called *the Douai Bible*. The Old Testament is said to have been compared with the Hebrew and the Greek, but this comparison must have been very limited. The Psalter, for instance, is given not from St. Jerome's version of the Hebrew, but from his revision of the faulty translation from the LXX., which commonly displaced it in Latin Bibles; and in general this version of the Old Testament is simply the ordinary, and not the pure, Latin text of Jerome in an English dress. Its merits and defects lie in its vocabulary, which has bestowed on our language innumerable Latin words, and offered us very many that we have refused to adopt. The translation of the New Testament is similar to that of the Old, and next to the Psalter, the Epistles are most inadequately done. One of their general principles was to adhere absolutely to the Latin; and while this course made much of their work awkward and obscure, they thus often reproduced the exact Latin order, and so the Greek, kept the phrase of the original

where others had abandoned it; and wherever the Latin failed, as in the matter of the article, or was ambiguous, they had the Greek at their command, which nice points of their work often show that they used. They had, as we have said, the Genevan Testament before them, and in many cases actually followed it. Here and there throughout the New Testament they have reproduced the original Greek in a faithful and happy manner not attained by any previous version, and we shall presently see the indebtedness of even King James' version to their work.

There were thus during the latter part of Elizabeth's reign two rival English Bibles, the Bishops', sanctioned by ecclesiastical authority for public use, and the Genevan, the common Bible of the people and even of scholars. This rivalry was undesirable, and in a conference on ecclesiastical affairs held at Hampton Court in 1603, soon after the accession of King James I., the then authorized version was brought up as a matter to be amended. The king desired that pains should be taken for one uniform translation, forbidding that any marginal notes should be added, and complaining of such as accompanied the Genevan Bible. He matured his scheme for the translation, and the list of the revisers was complete by June 30th. Precisely how this list was made up does not now appear, but the king announced to Bancroft, Bishop of London, that he had appointed four-and-fifty learned men for the work, of whom, however, only forty-seven appear in the list that has come down to us, but among them, we may add, there was no Nonconformist or Scottish or Irish scholar. They were divided into four companies for the Old Testament and two for the New, with a fixed portion of the work appointed for each company, to be done at Oxford, Cambridge, and Westminster, two companies working at each of these places. Their duty was carefully defined in a series of rules, fifteen in all, probably drawn up by Bishop Bancroft with the approbation of the king. They were required in general to follow the Bishops' Bible, but on occasion they might adopt the renderings of Tyndale, Matthew, Coverdale, Whitchurch (that is, *the Great Bible*, printed by Grafton and Whitchurch), and the Genevan. When the revision was completed at the different places of assembly, two members from each place, six in all, were chosen to superintend the final preparation for the printing in London. The work of the revision seems to have been actually undertaken in 1607, and Dr. Miles Smith, who wrote the preface, states therein that they were occupied with the work two years and nine months.

It appeared from the press in 1611 in one thick volume folio, and is a splendid monument of art. It is printed in elegant Gothic type, with the supplied words in small Roman, which are now given in italic letter, a practice introduced to some extent in the Genevan, but which had been wholly neglected in Luther's version. Careful researches have made it very probable that there were two issues in folio in 1611, and in the same year there was published an edition of the N. T. in 12mo. In 1628 the N. T. of the Authorized Version was first published in Scotland, at Edinburgh, and in 1633 the whole Bible there in 8vo. In 1638 the University printers of Cambridge printed an edition in folio, which bears clear marks of representing very exactly the true form of the Authorized Version, being more leisurely and carefully printed than the editions of 1611; in particular the matter of the supplied words is far more consistently given.

The printing of the Bishops' Bible was stopped when the new revision was undertaken, and no edition of it appears later than 1606, though the N. T. was printed as late as 1619. But the Genevan version, which was now chiefly confined to private use, competed with the Royal Bible for many years and was not displaced till about 1650. The king's revisers, it has always been admitted, were very competent to their work, and availed themselves of all the new apparatus within their reach. The appearance of the Rhemish Testament in 1582 had again called attention to the Latin Vulgate, which had been thrust aside by the revision of Erasmus and by the new Latin version of Beza, which had so largely influenced the Great Bible and the Genevan respectively. In the meantime Hebrew and Greek studies had been pursued with great care and zeal, and two important contributions had been made to the interpretation of the O. T. In 1572 Montanus, a Spanish scholar, added to the Antwerp Polyglot, which was published under the patronage of Philip II., an interlinear translation of the Hebrew based on that of Pagninus; and in 1575-79 Tremellius, a converted Jew, in conjunction with Junius, his son-in-law, published at Frankfurt-on-the-Maine an original Latin version of the O. T. with a commentary, which had an extensive circulation. Beside these works intended for scholars, three important vernacular translations had appeared. In 1587-88 a revision of the French Bible was published at Geneva, mainly it is said by Bertram, a distinguished Hebrew scholar, assisted by Beza and others; and at the same place in 1607 an Italian version by Diodati, who was

Professor of Hebrew at Geneva, but formerly of Lucca. Meanwhile two Spanish versions had appeared; one at Bâle in 1569 by Reyna, and a second based on Reyna's by de Valera at Amsterdam in 1602. And when in the preface to the Authorized Version Dr. Miles Smith, to the Chaldee, Hebrew, Syrian (which had become accessible by Tremellius' translation of the Peshito version at Heidelberg in 1569), and to the Greek and Latin authorities, adds the Spanish, French, Italian, and Dutch (Luther's German or a Dutch proper of 1560), he probably refers to these versions of Bertram, Diodati, and Reyna.

The Royal revisers did their work carefully and honestly. They differed from the Rhemish translators in seeking to make an intelligible translation, and from the Genevan in leaving Scripture uncolored by expository notes, though these two versions contributed most largely of all to the changes which King James' revisers introduced. The fourteenth of the king's rules allowed them to consult the Genevan, but the Rhemish was not on that list, and yet it was freely used. In the O. T. most of the changes are due to the Genevan Bible, to Pagninus' and Tremellius' Latin versions, but some are original. In the Prophets they followed chiefly the Genevan, while in the historical and poetical books they differ less from the Bishops' Bible. In the Apocrypha they are nearer to the Bishops' than to the Genevan, but here also there is much work that is new. They also drew from Leo Juda's and Münster's Latin versions. The revision of the New Testament was a simpler work than that of the Old, and consisted mostly of a careful examination of the Bishops' Bible with the Greek text, inferred to be mainly that of Beza's editions of 1589 and 1598, and with Beza's Latin and the Genevan and the Rhemish versions. The chief influence of the Rhemish on the Authorized Version was in its phraseology; that of Beza and the Genevan, on its interpretation. Many words and phrases are common to the Rhemish and the Authorized alone, or if found also in Wycliffe, some scholars incline to regard them as natural coincidences in two versions made independently from the Latin Vulgate. The whole work was so well executed as to prove itself in general a far better and more correct version than any that had preceded it; and it could never have held at all that place in the admiration and affection of English-speaking people which it has held for wellnigh three centuries, if it had not had great excellences. Its excellences are a general fidelity to the original Hebrew and Greek; a majesty and simplicity of style, now



energetic and spirited, and again easy and calm, according to the character of the passage; and much of the whole so precisely and so happily rendered that the wit of man seems unable to mend it. Some of its defects are a want of due care about the particles, sometimes rendering them inexactly, and again quite omitting them; here and there the neglect of the article, or the needless insertion of it, or the exaggeration of it by the use of the demonstrative pronoun; the retaining of certain Hebrew and Greek idioms, and more frequently Greek than Hebrew, which are harsh and unnatural to us, and which remain so even after our long use of them and great familiarity with them; the use of italics where they are wrongly placed or better omitted altogether; and, what is perhaps its chief fault, frequently, but with some admirable exceptions, rendering the same word or a cognate word or phrase differently in different places and sometimes even in the same sentence, which the revisers did on set purpose and even defended in their preface. Some of its defects are the work of time and inevitable in any version. Thus, some words and forms have become wholly obsolete, and some have changed their meaning; some new words and forms have been developed which more exactly and adequately express the sense of the original. Its greatest imperfection was due to the circumstances themselves under which the revisers did their work. There was down to that time no really critical treatment either of the Hebrew or the Greek Scriptures. The means of verifying and improving the Hebrew Bible were then very scanty, and the matter has not much improved since; but in the case of the New Testament, the MS. authorities, the ancient versions, the quotations of the early Fathers, even those that were accessible at that time, were not fully and carefully used, nor indeed was it the habit of the period to do this in a high degree with any ancient writers whatever. The settling of an ancient text by the examination and comparison of the best MSS., by the study of contemporary or the earliest possible records, by researches on whatever subject and in whatever direction is connected with the writings in hand, all this is a great modern achievement, the fruit of the studies and explorations of the last two hundred, and especially of the last hundred years. We have seen that the first edition of the Greek Testament, the Complutensian, was a representation of modern MSS. perhaps exclusively; that Erasmus' text, though helped by a few good MSS., differed but little from

the Complutensian; that Stephens followed Erasmus with an imperfect examination of a few other MSS.; and that Beza, whose text the revisers, as we have said above, seem chiefly to have relied upon, could have been improved by only two important MSS. and one ancient version, and even these he appears little to have used. And when the English Bible, reckoning from Tyndale, had been so often revised during the first hundred years, that a great nation like the English people, and the American people after them, should have remained comparatively content with their Bible uncorrected and unimproved for two hundred and seventy years, amid all the rich material—especially of the most ancient MSS. discovered or made accessible—which has been gathered by the providence of God and the unwearied diligence of great and good and learned men, this might well seem incredible, were it not a known and familiar fact.

Let us now consider what has been done for the text since 1611. The two editions published by the Elzevirs, the celebrated printers of Leyden, are historically of importance, though not critically. They were in 16mo, and executed with the grace and elegance that belong to this renowned series of publications. The first edition was published in 1624. It is without preface, and the text is broken only by paragraphs, the verses being indicated in the margin. The editor is unknown, but the printers themselves are supposed to have taken Stephens' edition of 1550 as their basis, introducing only slight changes, which they considered to be corrections, using for this purpose one of Beza's editions. In 1633 they brought out in the same convenient form their second edition, which is regarded as the best. The text is broken up into verses; care was taken to free it from typographical errors, and a high character was assumed for it. *Textum ergo habes*, they say in the preface, *nunc ab omnibus receptum; in quo nihil immutatum aut corruptum damus*, and hence the expression *the Received Text*, though this expression as now used denotes no precise text whatever. The Greek Testament in Walton's Polyglot in 1657 followed Stephens' text, as did Mill's in 1707; and in England *Stephens' is the Received Text*, and on the Continent the *Elzevirs' is the Received Text*. It is interesting to know how these texts stand toward each other. Mill (Proleg. 1307) reported twelve cases of variation, Tischendorf (Proleg. p. 85, 7th ed.) gave a list of 150, and Dr. Scrivener has detected even 287. Though thoughtful and scholarly men from this period down to the present time have been interested in the state of the Greek

text, and though certain scholars have bestowed much time and the most careful labor on matters contributing toward the settlement of it on a sound and permanent basis, yet after the appearance of the texts of Stephens and Beza the great body of Protestants ceased from all inquiry on what ground the Greek text rested; and what the Council of Trent did in 1545 in declaring the Latin Vulgate authentic and ultimate, the Protestants themselves tacitly did in regard to the received Greek text.

It is to English industry that we owe the first important efforts for the critical treatment of the text. The first large and important collection of various readings, drawn from MSS., is that contained in the 6th vol. of *Walton's Polyglot*, called also *the English or the London Polyglot*, 6 vols. folio, 1657. In the 5th vol., which was devoted to the New Testament in six different languages, the readings of *Codex A* or *Alexandrinus*, presented to Charles I. in 1628 and now in the British Museum, had for the first time been given; they were entered under the Greek text. Walton had also a collation of sixteen authorities, of which only three had even been used before, gathered by the care of Archbishop Ussher. That Walton did not try to form a corrected text is not at all to be regretted; for the time for that attempt had not yet arrived.

In 1675 Bishop Fell of Oxford published an edition in 8vo, with various readings at the foot of the page, with the authorities subjoined, and in his appendix he added the Barberini readings, collected about 1625 in the Barberini Library at Rome by Caryophilus of Crete, who had permission from Paul V. and Urban VIII. to use MSS. in the Vatican, including the precious *Codex B* or *Vaticanus*, for a projected edition of the Greek Testament.

At Oxford in 1707 appeared in one volume folio the Greek Testament of Dr. John Mill, the learned Principal of St. Edmund's Hall. To this great work he had cheerfully devoted the last thirty years of his life, dying only a fortnight after its publication. His purpose was to reproduce the text of Stephens' edition of 1550 and to bring together all the accessible critical materials existing. He gathered all the various readings which had previously been used, collated such Greek MSS. as were available, and first made general use of the ancient versions and of the writings of the ancient Fathers as witnesses of the ancient text. His Prolegomena are a monument of learning hardly to be dispensed with even now. Wetstein said that Dr. Mill had achieved more than all who had preceded him; and Herbert Marsh, Bishop of Peterborough,

the most accomplished Englishman of his time in these studies, said that in all his great labors he adhered strictly to the truth, never designedly misrepresenting any matter of criticism. He was not studied as he deserved to be by the later editors, and many of the best readings he adduced were overlooked by Wetstein, Griesbach, and Scholz. In 1709-19 Dr. Edward Wells of Oxford undertook to apply the results of critical investigation in his Greek Testament, which was accompanied with a revised English translation. This was the first attempt to supply a critically revised text.

In 1720 the illustrious Bentley of Trinity College, Cambridge, issued proposals for his edition of the New Testament in Greek and Latin, with the last chapter of Revelation as a specimen. This work was not accomplished, but the mere project was one of the most important steps ever taken in connection with the text of the New Testament. St. Jerome had stated that he revised the Vulgate according to the best Greek MSS., adding that even the order of the words was important in translations of Holy Scripture; and from this statement of St. Jerome, Bentley inferred that the oldest Greek MSS. ought to agree with the oldest Latin of St. Jerome both in words and in their order. This was the first proper appreciation of the old Latin versions, and the great critics of recent times, as we shall see, have acted upon Bentley's idea. Dr. Bentley's plan was to use all the authorities of the first five centuries, the Greek MSS., the oldest Latin MSS., the ancient versions, as the Syriac, the Gothic, the Coptic, and the Aethiopic, and all the Greek and Latin Fathers of the first five centuries, utterly disclaiming conjecture in the text itself. This great project of one of the greatest scholars the world ever saw was made near two centuries ago, and failed through the opposition of ignorance and of envy.

These sacred studies now passed from England to the Continent, scarcely to return till the middle of the present century. In 1734 appeared at Tübingen, in one vol. 4to, the edition of the learned and thoughtful and pious Bengel, Abbot of Alpirspach in the Lutheran communion. He gathered for his work such critical materials as he was able to gather himself, and made applications to others for collections. He placed in the margin those readings that he considered genuine, and at the end of his volume in his *Apparatus Criticus* he gave the various readings known to him with critical observations upon them; and, what was very important, he distinctly gave the evidence *for* as well as *against* each reading.

It was he that first enounced, among his rules of criticism, the great distinction between various readings: *Proclivi scriptioni praestat ardua, The more difficult the reading, the more likely to be genuine*; for a copyist, if he makes any change, is more likely to change the more difficult into an easier form. We owe Bengel much for his improvement of the punctuation of the text and its more correct division into paragraphs, and with him originated the idea of *families* or *recensions* of the MSS., which was afterwards developed by Semler, Griesbach, and Scholz, and which contains reasonable and true elements, however difficult it has proved to be to adjust any form of it. He himself wished to divide all the documents into *Asiatic*, written in or about Constantinople, which he less esteemed, and *African*, the few which he thought to be of a better type.

In 1751-52 appeared the great edition of John James Wetstein in Amsterdam, in 2 vols. folio, the critical portion of which places the author in the very highest rank, leaving him inferior, if to any, to only one or two of the very highest names. Wetstein was born at Bâle in 1693, and studied at the University and became a minister. His taste for Biblical studies showed itself early; and when he was ordained in 1713 he delivered a disputation *De variis N. T. Lectionibus*. In 1714 his search for MSS. led him to Paris; and in 1715-16 and again in 1720 he visited England, and was employed by Bentley in collecting materials for his projected edition, for which Wetstein first made a complete collation of the great *Codex C* or *Ephraemi* in the Royal Library of Paris, which he also used for his own edition. In 1730 he published at Bâle *Prolegomena ad N. T. Graeci Editionem accuratissimam*, etc. Some divines, dreading his unsettling the text by his studies and publications, had a decree of the Senate promulgated against his undertaking, and he was deposed from the ministry and driven into exile. He was invited to Amsterdam by the College of the Remonstrants, and succeeded the famous Le Clerc as Professor of Philosophy and History. He here died in 1754, two years after he finished his edition of the Greek Testament, the result of the arduous labors of about forty years. Never before had there been given so full and so methodical an account of the MSS., ancient versions, and Fathers, by whose aid the text of the N. T. may be revised, as was given in his *Prolegomena*. The number of MSS. which he had himself collated, if we reckon separately every distinct portion of the N. T. contained in a MS., was about 102,



and about eleven were examined for him by other hands. He collected the collations of Mill and others, and reexamined many of the ancient versions and Fathers. The upper part of the page of his edition contains the text, the Elzevir of 1633; below this stand the variations, if any, that were approved by Wetstein, which amount to about 500, and those chiefly in the Apocalypse, no conjectures whatever being admitted into the text, though often quoted in the notes; then followed the various readings of the MSS.; and below were illustrative passages from the classical authors, Talmudical and Rabbinical extracts, etc., and so full is this that many a scholar falling in with a striking passage illustrating the form or thought of Holy Scripture, and imagining that he was the first to notice it, will find it already laid up in this rich storehouse of Wetstein. His principles of revision were for the most part excellent, but he failed himself in applying them. In one of his theories he was quite wrong. It had long been noticed that some of the Greek MSS., which are accompanied with a Latin version, as *Codex D* or *Bezae*, *Codex E* (of the Acts and Cath. Epp.) or *Laudianus*, and *Codex D* (of the Pauline Epp.) or *Claromontanus*, remarkably agreed with the readings of the Latin; and the suspicion arose, but now regarded as unfounded, that the Greek of such MSS. had been conformed to the Latin, and hence the term *Codices Latinizantes*. Wetstein carried the charge of Latinizing to every one of the more ancient MSS., and this view damaged his labors; but as his critical and illustrative matter has never been reproduced as a whole, his Greek Testament is one of the few books that remain invaluable in their original form. His *Prolegomena* were reproduced at Halle in 1764 in 8vo by the learned J. S. Semler, Professor of Theology, with excellent notes and certain MSS. in *fac-simile*.

The vast mass of materials collected by Wetstein remained to be arranged, and steadily and consistently and critically used to emend the text. This was undertaken by John James Griesbach, Professor of Theology at Jena, with whom in a high sense texts really critical begin. In 1775-77 appeared at Halle, in 2 vols. 8vo, what is called his *first edition*. In this he used Wetstein's materials, examined many MSS. himself, and also fully collated a few. He differed from Wetstein in his estimate of the more ancient MSS. and agreed with Bentley and Bengel. He approved of the division by Bengel of the MSS. into *African* and *Byzantine*, but subdivided the former into two parts, maintaining that there were three classes

of text, two ancient and one more modern, thus agreeing with the view of Bentley that the MSS. have come down to us from three sources, *the West, Egypt, and Asia*. Griesbach named these three classes *Western, Alexandrine, and Constantinopolitan*. The first he conceived was the early text, but much marred by the errors of scribes; the second a revision of the same; and the third flowing from the other two, calling them all *recensions*; and he believed that the two former existed distinct toward the close of the II<sup>d</sup> century. He ranged his critical authorities under his three recensions, and in forming his text he placed more reliance on the agreement of the recensions than on any other external evidence. Twenty years after the publication of his first edition, during which period important critical materials had been amassed by the labors of Matthiae of Moscow, of Alter of Vienna, and especially of Birch of Copenhagen, and the publication of the *Codex Laudianus*, the *Codex Alexandrinus*, and the *Codex Bezae* had taken place, Griesbach, availing himself of all this aid, published at Halle the first volume of his *second edition* in 1796, and ten years later, in 1806, the second volume completing the work. His plan in this edition was enlarged, corrected, and improved; and he no longer insists on the refinements of theory about the additions and peculiarities of *the three recensions*. The weak point of his theory was the impossibility of drawing the line between the Western and the Alexandrian recensions, and in his *Commentarius Criticus*, published in 1811, the year before his death, though still clinging to his theory of a triple recension, he shows that Origen does not support him in this view, as he had once anticipated. As to the text he formed, where he differed from *the received text*, he generally gave a reading better attested, though in many cases not the best supported, and on the whole made great improvements. In the adjustment of conflicting probabilities he has scarcely been surpassed by any Biblical critic. Mill and Bengel approached him in this; Wetstein and Scholz were very far behind him.

In 1830-36 appeared at Leipsic in two vols. 4to the critical edition of John M. A. Scholz, Catholic Professor of Theology in the University of Bonn. He too had a recension theory, according to which all the MSS. were divided into five families, two *African* (Alexandrian and Western), one *Asiatic*, one *Byzantine*, and one *Cyprian*. This theory at a later period he rejected, and reverted to the theory of Bengel, that there were only two families, *the Alexandrian and the Constantinopolitan*; but he adopted the view

that the earlier text is to be sought among the Constantinopolitan MSS., and that the Alexandrian are less important, a view precisely the reverse of what is now known to be true. The labors of Scholz found many advocates in England among those who had not carefully studied the subject and among those who deprecated the application of criticism to the Greek Testament, and his text was accordingly reprinted there as a manual. Scholz did indeed good service as a traveller and explorer after MSS., and he has in the first instance pointed out where many are preserved; but his own collations as printed in his edition have turned out to be very inaccurately done.

This brings us to the three greatest names of this century, Lachmann, Tischendorf, and Tregelles, names so great that no other is associated with them in authority in the present constitution of the text.

In 1831 a duodecimo volume appeared in Berlin, with the title, *Novum Testamentum Graece ex recensione Caroli Lachmanni*. Lachmann was a professor in the University of Berlin, well known for his critical labors on the masterpieces of German literature, on the Latin poets, and above all on Lucretius, his edition of whom placed him in the foremost rank as a critic and left an impress on Latin study which has been productive of the highest results. This small edition of the Greek Testament was the result of his close labor and study carried on through five years. His purpose was to give the text the form in which the most ancient MSS. have transmitted it, and he professed implicitly to follow such MSS. so far as the then existing collations made them accessible. The oldest Greek MSS. compared with the citations of Origen formed the basis of his work; the readings of the old Latin versions, as found in unrevised MSS., and the citations of the Latin Fathers were his subsidiary aids. It was thus that his text was formed, not necessarily giving what he would consider to be the true text, but the transmitted text of about the IVth century. This text he considered would be a basis for criticism, delivered from the readings of the XVIth century, and bringing us back to a period a thousand years or more nearer to the time when the several books of the New Testament were written. In constructing the text he did not follow his own judgment, but the use of the most ancient Oriental Churches; and when this was not uniform, he preferred what was supported by African and Italian consent; and where there was great uncertainty, he indicated this partly by putting the

word or words in square brackets in the text, and partly by putting a different reading at the foot of the page; and in St. Matthew, for instance, there are forty-five cases of such bracketing, and twenty-seven readings added at the foot of the page. At the end of the volume, pp. 461-503, a list is given of the readings wherein he differs from the Elzevir edition, about 5000 in number. Lachmann thus intended by his labors to place the Greek Testament wholly on the ground of actual and early documentary authority. As this edition was altogether without preface, and the only account he had given of his purpose and plan consisted of a few words at the head of his list of the Elzevir readings just mentioned, and of an article in the *Theol. Studien u. Kritiken*, 1830, his work was much misunderstood or misrepresented. But when it became better appreciated, as it did, he was urged to undertake an edition which should fully set forth his authorities for all his readings, and to this he consented. In 1837 he obtained the aid of Philip Buttmann, son of the great Greek grammarian and critic, to arrange the authorities for the Greek, on which Buttmann was engaged for seven years. In 1839 Lachmann and Buttmann went to Fulda, in Hesse Cassel, to examine and copy the *Codex Fuldensis*, of the ante-Jerome or Old Latin text, of about A. D. 550, for the use of the new edition. In 1842, at Berlin, in 8vo, appeared the first volume, containing the Four Gospels; and to this volume a preface of 56 pp. was prefixed. The variations in the text from the small edition are not many, and they are thus explained: the text of the small edition is wholly based on the Oriental sources, as he designated them; and where these sources differ, the text is based on the consent of the Italian and the African sources; while in the larger edition, Lachmann used the combined evidence of Eastern and Western authorities. In the upper part of the page stands his recension of the text, brackets being used as before to indicate what was of doubtful authority, and below readings are placed as to which the authorities differ; the middle part of the page contains the authorities, the Greek arranged by Buttmann and the Latin by himself; and the lower part of the page is occupied with the Latin version edited mostly on the authority of the *Codices Fuldensis* and *Amiatinus*; but for the latter Buttmann was able to use only the very imperfect and inaccurate collation of Fleck (Lips. 1840, 12mo). This edition thus accomplished much that Bentley himself had projected so long before. The Greek MS. authorities which Lachmann admitted were very few; thus, in the Gospels he used only A, B,

C and D, and the fragments P, Q, T and Z; the only ancient version he used was the Latin; and the only Fathers he employed were of the Greek, Irenaeus and Origen; and of the Latin, Cyprian, Hilary of Poitiers, Lucifer of Cagliari, and in the Apocalypse Primasius. In some places he follows none of the Greek authorities on which he avowedly relies, as in the latter chapters of the Apocalypse; in these cases, though he omitted to give the authorities, he considered that the combined text of the other authorities warranted him in giving the readings which he adopts. The printing of the second volume was completed as to the text in 1845, but it was not published till 1850, about a year before his death. To this volume he prefixed notes on some passages in regard to which he had been censured, and gives here and there his own conjectures as to the true readings of other passages, using the traditional reading of the IVth century as the basis. But it is not to be forgotten that at that time it was possible for him to have but one MS. of the IVth century, *Codex B* or *Vaticanus*, and only an imperfect collation of that. The rest of the MSS. that he used date from the Vth century (A, C, T) to the IXth (G), and of these Buttmann's representation, though made not without care, was not full and exact. His Greek text seldom rests on more than four *codices*, very often on three, and not unfrequently on two; in St. Matt. vi. 20-vii. 5, and in 165 out of the 405 verses of the Apocalypse, on but one. His edition, while founded on too few documents and authorities even for his own time, has the merit of restoring the ancient Latin versions to their proper rank in the criticism of the New Testament, and of presenting an admirably revised text of the Vulgate; of giving, as Bengel had done before him, an improved punctuation of the text, which received the commendation of Tischendorf; and above all, of exerting great power over candid and inquiring minds, which will not hereafter claim for *the Received Text*, as such, any more weight than it is entitled to as the representative of the few and mostly late MSS. on which it was actually constructed.

Constantine von Tischendorf, having studied theology and philology in Leipsic, there published in 1841, in square 12mo, his first edition of the Greek Testament. Though this was greatly inferior to his subsequent critical editions, it merited the encouragement it procured for him, and the commendation of the learned Professor Schulz, of the University of Breslau, who had himself in 1827 published the first volume of a new and greatly improved edition



of Griesbach's N. T. This first edition of Tischendorf added to the text some of the authorities on which it was based, and contained *Prolegomena* partly explaining his own principles of procedure, and partly discussing the matter of *recensions* with special reference to the theories of Scholz. It is evident that the smaller edition of Lachmann had influenced Tischendorf to adopt readings according to ancient authority, though he did not do this in a uniform manner. Soon afterwards he set out on his first literary journey, and while engaged on a collation of *Codex C* or *Ephraemi* in the Royal Library of Paris, he was induced to prepare three bookseller's editions, which appeared in Paris in 1843: one dedicated to Guizot, one having the Greek in a parallel column with the Vulgate and somewhat altered to suit it, and a third containing the Greek text of the second without the Latin Vulgate. In addition to his subsequent critical studies at home, he undertook other journeys to examine, collate, and publish MSS., chiefly of the N. T. He was in Italy in 1843 and 1866; four times visited England in 1842-49-55-65; three times visited the East, where his chief discovery, that of the *Codex*  $\aleph$  or *Sinaiticus* in the Convent of St. Catherine on Mt. Sinai, was made partly in 1844 and completely in 1859.

In 1849 appeared at Leipsic his fifth (2d critical) edition in square 12mo, in which the text was given as he then thought it ought to be revised after his further studies and researches. This was an advance upon his edition of 1841, but still defective, especially in the earlier portion of the work. In the *Prolegomena* to this edition he gives an account of his own labors since the appearance of the first edition, the critical principles he now adopted, the dialect of the N. T., the subject of *recensions*, etc. In this edition the various readings in the Acts, the Epistles, and the Revelation are given less sparingly than in the Gospels. His view in regard to the formation of the text was that the text was to be sought only from ancient evidence and especially from Greek MSS., but without neglecting the testimonies of ancient versions and Fathers, thus adopting Lachmann's fundamental principle. He adds that when testimonies differ, the most ancient Greek MSS. deserve special confidence, and by these he means the MSS. from the IVth to about the IXth century, but with this qualification, that the authority of the older of these is much the greater. He admitted, however, many modifications of this principle, which might in application materially interfere with a recurrence to the oldest class

of MSS. As to *recensions* he thinks the MSS. may admit a four-fold division, and be called Alexandrine and Latin, Asiatic and Byzantine; not however as four classes, but as two pairs, the first pair comprehending the more ancient MSS., the latter the more recent; but he did not allow this theory to influence his judgment in applying his critical rules. Where the text of Tischendorf and that of Lachmann differ from the common text they often agree together, from the circumstance that both editors ascribed the highest value to ancient authorities; and where Tischendorf differs from Lachmann, he commonly follows some other of the ancient MSS.

Tischendorf's seventh (3d critical) edition, published in parts at Leipsic 1856-59, is in 2 vols. 8vo, pp. vol. 1, Prol. 278, 696, vol. 2, 681, and in a smaller form in 12mo, an almost unparalleled monument of learning and diligence, but having the fault of being constructed almost without reference to the cursive MSS. A very interesting feature of this edition is the fact that in it he returns to the Received Text in 595 cases in which he had previously departed from it. Even this edition was eclipsed by the amazing work that followed, his eighth (4th critical) edition, also published in parts 1865-72, in 2 vols. 8vo, pp. vol. 1, 968, vol. 2, 1044, and a smaller form in 12mo, the text of both of which was complete; but before he had written the Prolegomena to the larger edition or the Preface to the smaller, after and probably in consequence of his great and unceasing labors in these sacred studies for some thirty years, he was smitten with paralysis and died in December, 1874. This eighth edition was the most full and comprehensive edition ever published by any editor, containing down to the time of its publication an account of the latest collations and discoveries, and as copious a body of various readings as was compatible with the design of adapting the work to general use, but the notes of the readings of the cursive MSS. are not sufficiently minute. To the general accuracy of Dr. Tischendorf's collations, Dr. Tregelles and Dr. Scrivener, the two scholars best qualified to follow him critically over a portion of his vast field of labor, bear cheerful testimony. So great is the excellence of the *Codex Sinaiticus* and the *Codex Vaticanus*, which seem to be of nearly equal antiquity, that Tischendorf and Tregelles and Dr. Scrivener are often divided in their judgments about the true readings where these MSS. differ, and those competent to form an opinion on the subject judge that Tischendorf was carried too far in his preference for the *Codex*

*Sinaiticus*, who follows it sometimes when all other high authority and even his own principles are against it ; for in his edition of this MS. (Leipsic, 8vo, 1865) although the last verse of St. John's Gospel xxi. 25 has the express testimony of Origen, Tischendorf excludes it because in that MS. this one verse seemed to him to be written with fresher ink and so perhaps by a later hand. His reputation as a Biblical scholar rests less on his critical editions of the N. T. than on the chief uncial texts which he has given to the world. His examination, collation, and discoveries of Biblical MSS. surpass those of any scholar that ever lived. In 1854 he published in Leipsic in 4to a critical edition of the *Codex Amiatinus* found in the monastery on Monte Amiata and now in Florence, written about 541, and considered as the very best MS. of St. Jerome's version. He also paid more attention than any other scholar to the MSS. of the LXX., and published four editions of it in 2 vols. 8vo, the last in 1869.

In 1865, Dr. Tischendorf, in acknowledgment of his great and learned labors, received honorary degrees from the Universities of Cambridge and Oxford ; and in 1869, in consideration of his illustrious services in the matter of the *Codex Sinaiticus*, which through his influence passed into the Imperial Library of St. Petersburg, the Czar by imperial ukase bestowed on him the rank of an hereditary noble of the Russian Empire.

Samuel Prideaux Tregelles, LL. D., was born at Falmouth, England, in 1813, of Quaker parentage, and educated at Falmouth Classical School. As early as 1838 he formed the purpose of preparing a critical edition of the Greek Testament, and pursued this object throughout his life. In 1844 he first became generally known as the editor of *The Book of Revelation in Greek, edited from ancient authorities ; with a New English Version ;* and this attempt was received by the scholars of the Church of England with great gratitude and respect for his earnestness and his independent views. In this work he gave some account of the critical principles on which he had proceeded, and announced his intention of editing the Greek Testament with various readings. He had a just admiration for Lachmann and defended him against many objections and misconceptions, and he adopted himself essentially the plan of this great critic, withdrawing from it those features that were manifestly indefensible. It consisted in resorting to ancient authorities alone ; that is, to those uncial MSS. which are not Lectionaries, except the cursive MSS. 1, 33, and 69 of the Gospels and 61 of the

Acts, which he admits among his authorities because they preserve an ancient text; and to the ancient versions and Fathers, especially Origen and Eusebius. Beside his examination and collation of MSS. in Great Britain, he undertook several foreign journeys for the same purpose. In 1845 he went to the Continent chiefly to collate the *Codex Vaticanus*, the most important, as he considered, of all the N. T. MSS.; he was in Rome five months, and though he repeatedly saw this MS. and enjoyed the favor and sympathy of Cardinal Acton, he was not allowed to transcribe any of its readings. He inspected several other MSS. in the Vatican, among which was the *Codex Basilianus*, one of the only three uncialia that contain the Apocalypse, and this contains it entire. At Florence he collated the *Codex Amiatinus* of St. Jerome's version and Tischendorf's excellent edition of this MS. is based on the combined collations of Dr. Tregelles and his own. He made collations also of MSS. at Modena, Venice, Bâle, and Munich, returning to England in 1846. In 1849 he visited Paris and collated the *Codex Claromontanus*; and again in 1850 he visited Paris, Hamburg, Berlin, Leipsic, and Dresden. During these visits he made the acquaintance at Bâle of the learned de Wette, the disciple of Griesbach; in Berlin he saw much of Lachmann and discussed with him many points of N. T. criticism; and in Leipsic he visited Tischendorf and compared some of his own collations with those made by him. Before he went abroad in 1845 he saw in England the celebrated explorer Scholz, who informed him where certain MSS. were then to be found. In 1860 the present writer carried some memoranda on these studies to London for Dr. Tregelles, from Dr. Abbot of Harvard University, and at that time Dr. Tregelles was absent in Spain to consult certain MSS. there; these memoranda were placed in the hand of Mr. William Chalk, whose services in reading the proof-sheets of his Greek Testament Dr. Tregelles mentions kindly and honorably in the introductory notice to the second part of the work. In 1848 he remodelled his translation of the Book of Revelation, omitting the Greek, but conforming, as he was now able to do, the text more closely to the ancient MSS. In 1849 he became acquainted with the *Curetonian Syriac* Fragments of the Gospels, which was a MS. found by Dr. William Cureton among the MSS. in the British Museum, brought in 1842 from the Nitrian Monasteries. This hitherto unknown version, altogether ancient in its readings, served to confirm the critical views which Dr. Tregelles had previously formed and published. In 1854

he published a volume in 8vo replete with exact and valuable information, and intended as a full and formal exposition of his own critical principles, entitled *An Account of the Printed Text of the Greek New Testament*. In 1856 he rewrote rather than reëdited the fourth volume of *Horne's Introduction to the Scriptures*, under the special title of *An Introduction to the Textual Criticism of the New Testament*.

At length, after all this faithful preparatory work, he put forth in 1857 the first part, containing the Gospels of St. Matthew and St. Mark, of *The Greek New Testament, edited from ancient authorities; with their various readings in full, and the Latin Version of St. Jerome*. It was published through the Messrs. Bagster of London, and in every way in their best style, surpassing in beauty every edition of the Greek Testament that had preceded it. The form is a 4to, with the Greek text in a large Porson type, and with the Latin of St. Jerome (after the *Codex Amiatinus*) in a narrow column on the right in small type, and below in three columns the authorities for the Greek, and the readings of the Clementine Vulgate or authorized edition of the Church of Rome. In 1861 appeared the second part, comprising the Gospels of St. Luke and St. John. In that year he was struck with paralysis, but so far recovered that he was able to publish the Acts and the Catholic Epistles in 1865, and the Epistles of St. Paul down to 2d Thess. in 1869. Early in 1870, while revising the concluding chapters of the Apocalypse, he had a second and very severe stroke of his disorder. The rest of the Pauline Epistles were sent out in 1870 as he himself had prepared them, and the Apocalypse in 1872, in as good a state as Dr. Tregelles' papers could enable them, by his friends Mr. Bloxside and Mr. Newton. Dr. Tregelles lingered in a helpless condition, and died in 1875. The seventh and concluding part, containing the *Prolegomena*, *Addenda*, and *Corrigenda*, was compiled and edited in 1879 by the Rev. Prof. Hort and the Rev. Mr. Streane of the University of Cambridge, who seem to have entertained the kindest and most considerate regard for the memory of this most devoted Christian scholar.

The authorities that Dr. Tregelles adduced for his text were much less copious than those of Tischendorf, but far more abundant than those of Lachmann. They were collated by himself or by Tischendorf, and in only a few instances by others. That his great work was most thoroughly and conscientiously done, no one has denied; in some parts of his collations, wherein he has since been followed



by others, he was found to be scrupulously exact, and where Tischendorf and Dr. Tregelles differ in their account of British MSS., Dr. Tregelles is seldom in the wrong; in the discussions between these great critics about personal accuracy, which sometimes took place, Dr. Tregelles always appears in an amiable light. It must be admitted that he investigated the character of his authorities more than Tischendorf found time and opportunity to do, and on the basis of this investigation he undertook (Horne's Introduction, IV, p. 106 sqq., edited by Dr. Tregelles), at least for the Gospels, to group the uncials according to their quality and affinity, which he accomplished in a masterly manner.

It was the purpose then of Lachmann to form an ancient and diplomatic text. His purpose was a great conception, but his authorities were too few, and the Greek MSS. he employed were imperfectly collated by Buttmann. The MSS. B, C and D, out of his four primary documents (A, B, C witnesses for the East, and D for the West), were, as Tischendorf, N. T. 7th ed. Prol. p. cix., has shown, not as yet properly edited, and the *Codex Sinaiticus* was not yet known. Tischendorf and Dr. Tregelles followed Lachmann, with the same general purpose in view. Tischendorf's explorations and discoveries and reproduction in permanent form of uncial MSS. are, as has been said, his chief merit, and this is immense; and his examination and collation of MSS., both uncial and cursive, were extensive, and his critical apparatus the most copious yet brought together. But it was not to be expected that he would have the requisite time and strength left to form a text of the highest authority, and he was too much swayed by some of the documents which he had himself discovered. Dr. Tregelles, diligent, persevering, conscientious, while admitting authorities far beyond the limits of Lachmann, yet founded his work on too narrow a basis, and throughout the Gospels was without the *Codex Sinaiticus*, and in St. Matthew and St. Mark without the full collation of the *Codex Vaticanus*. For the rest, he had all the most important apparatus that Tischendorf used, and it is a matter of great satisfaction that they agree so far as they do in the results of their labors. But it is no disparagement to these great men to say, that they could not collate and also edit the vast materials which had become accessible. For the materials for editing the New Testament are more abundant than those of any other writings that have come down to us; and it was the very abundance of them that seemed to perplex the mind of Tischendorf, and

brought upon him the charge of fickleness for the changes he made in his work. Let us add a word on this matter of documentary evidence in the case of the New Testament and elsewhere.

The number of MSS. of the whole N. T., or of parts, which we now possess, have been computed as follows: *Uncials*, or those executed in capitals and designated by capitals, as  $\alpha$ , *A, B, C*, etc., and written from the IVth to the Xth century, 127; *Cursives*, or those executed in small letters and designated by numbers, as 1, 2, 3, etc., and written from the Xth to the XVth century, 1456, making in all 1583. The earliest dated MS. of the N. T. is *Codex S* of the Gospels or *Vaticanus*, which was written in A. D. 949. In the case of the Old Testament the whole number of Hebrew MSS. collated by Dr. Kennicott and De Rossi was 1200, almost all of these having been written between A. D. 1000 and 1457, and almost every one of those written before the VIIIth or the VIIth century of our era having been lost or destroyed. The earliest with a certain date was written A. D. 1106, but one (Pinner No. 1, at Odessa) has a subscription stating that it was corrected at a date corresponding to A. D. 580; and if this statement is true, then this is the most ancient Hebrew MS. now known to exist. But both the Greek Testament and the Hebrew Bible rest on far more numerous, and the Greek Testament on more ancient, documents than the generality of the Greek and the Roman writers. The oldest MS. of Aeschylus, the *Codex Mediceus* in Florence, is probably of the Xth century, and the oldest of Euripides of the XIIth. There is but one MS. of Demosthenes of the first class, the *Codex S*, in the Royal Library of Paris, of the XIth century. Ennius, the father of Latin poetry, exists only in fragments, his entire works being supposed to have been lost irrecoverably in the XIIIth century. Of the twenty-one plays attributed to Plautus by Varro, one utterly disappeared during the Middle Ages, and at the beginning of the XVth century only the first eight were known to exist, the other twelve being discovered about 1428; and the two best MSS. of this author are very imperfect. Cicero's letters to Atticus and to his brother Quintus, some of the most precious remains of profane antiquity, exist only in a MS. made by Petrarch from an ancient copy since lost, and his *Brutus* and *Orator*, two of his elaborate rhetorical works, have come down to us in the same way by another modern hand. Only a single MS. of Velleius Paterculus is now known to exist, and that is a modern copy of an ancient MS. now lost. The first six books of the Annals

of Tacitus exist only in a single ancient MS., and that incomplete.

Undoubtedly a large number of the changes of Lachmann, Tischendorf, and Dr. Tregelles, in which all three agree, have been made on adequate authority and will stand approved; but there are still many that seem to rest on insufficient evidence and that are in themselves very unsatisfactory, not to persons ignorant of these matters, but to scholars most competent of all men living to form a judgment about them, as Dr. Scrivener in England and Dr. Wieseler in Germany. What we still need for the settling of the uncertain and unsatisfactory readings is a long and careful and laborious searching among all the documents known to us, cursive as well as uncial; and while the most ancient MSS. and the citations of the most important Fathers, both Greek and Latin, will naturally have the highest interest and often the greatest weight, yet wherever they differ or give exegetically an unsatisfactory reading, we must have recourse to every proper source of every period to help us reach the true reading and form a settled text. The providence of God has created here an occasion for the most patient and the most laborious efforts of Christian scholars. Such a text is sure to be formed at some time, though it may be done only by degrees; and it is worth the waiting for, even if it requires another century or more to accomplish it. In the meantime, and after this long period of waiting, it seems expedient to have a revision of the English New Testament conformed as well as may be to the results of the study and research of these great critics, but still subject, as of course it must be, to the modifications and corrections required by further study and research in regard to the original text.

CHARLES SHORT.

## II.—ON THE CONSONANT DECLENSION IN OLD NORSE.<sup>1</sup>

### II.

Let us pass to the n. pl. The Gothic endings *-jus*, *-eis* come from *-a<sub>1</sub>ua<sub>1</sub>s* *-a<sub>1</sub>ja<sub>1</sub>s* as above stated; from these we have the following forms in the other dialects: O. N. *hellir gestir*, *hend(i)r floeðir* (?), O. E. *fēt(e) byre*, *byrig* (for *byrg(e)*), O. H. G. *fuozzi belge*, *hendi ensti*. Most plurals of the Old Norse *i*-stems, however, cannot come from the ending *-a<sub>1</sub>ja<sub>1</sub>s* without assuming that they have either suffered 'rückumlaut' as Leskien Dek. 79 explains them,<sup>2</sup> or we must explain their umlaut and non-umlaut as a matter of caprice or accident in the coloring or non-coloring of the suffixal vowel, which of course is only a makeshift. A third explanation of the umlaut is suggested by Blomberg through the influence of the *-ja(-jô)* stems. All of these explanations are very unsatisfactory.

What kind of an ending, then, may pertinently be asked, must that have been which produced no umlaut? For the umlaut is inevitable if we retain the regular ending *-a<sub>1</sub>ja<sub>1</sub>s*.

The forms to be considered here are: 1. Masculine n. pl. like *bragir*, feminines like *ástir*; 2. The pronouns *-þeir* *-þær*, the numeral *tveir* *tvær*; 3. The adjectives masc. pl. *blindir*, fem. *blindar* (if this form is to be regarded as belonging indeed to the pronominal declension, and not analogous to the *ô*-declension).

If we analyse this ending *-ir*, we shall get an *-<sup>A</sup>ja<sub>1</sub>s* or *-a<sub>1</sub>j<sup>A</sup>s*, i. e. one of the *a*'s must be of a different quality than *a<sub>1</sub>*; for *-a<sub>1</sub>ja<sub>1</sub>s* would give, as we have seen, an umlaut-producing *-ir*. Where, then, is an *-<sup>A</sup>ja<sub>1</sub>s* or *-a<sub>1</sub>j<sup>A</sup>s* to be found from whence these forms could borrow their exceptional ending? The case seems difficult, and yet I believe these forms to be remnants of a much older

<sup>1</sup> This article resumes the discussion at the point at which it was broken off in the first article in Vol. II, p. 30-49, and therefore preliminary remarks are considered unnecessary.

<sup>2</sup> Cf., however, Heinzel Endsilben 413, 427, whose reasons are a complete refutation of this theory.

method of forming the n. pl., which, except in these forms, has disappeared in the Teutonic family, and also in most of the other cognate languages.

We know that the *a*- and *ā*-stems in Greek and Latin borrow their endings *-oi*- *ai*-, *-i*- *-ae*- (= *-ai*-) in the n. pl. from that of the pronoun, as it still appears in the Sanskrit *tai* (*tās*), Greek *τοί ται* (Dorico-epic), Lat. *is-ti is-tae*, Gothic *þai* (*þās*). That this ending, however, was not the only one is sufficiently shown by the Italic forms with *s*, thus *Romanos*, the Oscan *Nivlanús*, the Umbrian *Ikuvinus* and the near eighteen examples of plurals of the second declension in *-es*.<sup>1</sup> It was not even the only ending of the pronoun as is proved by the Lat. n. pl. *his-ce quis*, the Old Baktrian *vis'pes'-c'a* omnesque (i. e. *vis'pay-as'-c'a*; cf. examples in Bücheler 42 sq., Bopp § 228<sup>a</sup>). From these examples we may conclude that the ending of the n. pl. both of the substantive and of the pronoun had at one time an *-s*- which was lost at an early period. Another element was introduced into the composition of the nominative plural of the pronominal stem *ta*- (m.) *tā*- (f.), viz. the enlargement of the stem by *i* (cf. Bopp § 228), a frequent addition, which the Greek forms *τοί ται* confirm. The full n. pl. of the pronominal stem *ta*- *tā*- would therefore be *tajas t̥jas* (cf. Bopp as above, Schleicher Comp.<sup>4</sup> 516, 517, 611, 612), from which after apocope of the *s* we have Skr. *tē* (*tai*) (*tās*), Greek *τοί ται*, Lat. *is-ti is-tae*.

Returning to the Teutonic, we find these primitive forms peculiarly adapted to an explanation of the pronoun. From *tajas t̥jas* we should have in primitive Teutonic *þeiz þāiz* (or *þāz*) according as the *j* should be dropped or retained. We find in Gothic *þai*, where the *s* was dropped either at an early date, as in Sanskrit *tai*, Greek *τοί*, Lat. *is-ti*, or possibly, not till the primitive Teutonic time, which latter opinion the Old Norse *þeir þær* favors. This would account for the retention of the *i* in *þai*. *þās* may reflect the Skr. *tās* without the *i* enlargement, or may come from *t̥jas* by dropping the *j* between two vowels. *þeiz* gave Old Norse *þeir*, which probably remained uncontracted into *þir* after the analogy of the g. pl. *þeir(r)a*, d. pl. *þeim* (= Skr. *tēsham, tēbhyas*), or perhaps the tendency in Teutonic monosyllabic stems to lengthen their vowel would account for this uncontracted form, thus early *þeir* (cf. Sievers in P. B. II 122). The Old Norse fem. *þær* confirms a dropping

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Bücheler, Grundr. d. l. Dek. herausg. von Windehilde, pp. 36, 37, Kühner Ausf. Gramm. d. l. Spr. 1877, p. 289, 18; but against this explanation cf. Leskien, Dek. 81, Corssen, Kuhn's Zs. xvi, 296 sqq.



of the *j* in the Gothic *þōs*: the primitive *tājas* would give in the first period (cf. Heinzel c. l. 7 (347) *þājar* of which the *þær* of the MS. period is the regular reflection, the *j* having left its trace in the umlaut of the *ā*.<sup>1</sup> In the same manner *tveir* and *tvær* are to be explained from the stem *dva-* *dvā-*.

The ending of the nom. plur. masc. of the Old Norse adj. has also, in my opinion, employed this pronominal ending *-ajas*: thus from the stem *blinda-* we have *\*blinda- + ajas* *\*blindājas* *\*blindeir* *\*blindir* *blindir*, though there would be no objection to Scherer's (G. D. S. 401) explanation that it is formed from the n. pl. of the pronoun *i*. The n. pl. of the fem. adj. offers the same choice as the fem. pronoun did; it comes either directly from Gothic *blindōs* or from *\*blinda- + ājas* *\*blindār* *blindar* by dropping the *j*, contraction and shortening of the vowel, if Gothic *blindōs* itself is not rather from *\*blinda- ājas*.

In the preceding discussion of the ending *-ir* we have left our first class *bragir* and *astir* entirely out of the question, and before we proceed to the discussion of their n. pl., which, on account of the confusion into which this declension has fallen in Old Norse, is the most difficult question of our whole investigation, we will establish a test by which we can decide whether a given form is a regular *i*-form or whether its course of development has been affected by causes outside of those common to these stems, *i. e.* whether analogy or form-association has had an influence upon them. *Belgr* and *bragr* indicate only too plainly that causes have acted in the development of the one which did not act, or were counteracted, in that of the other, and by going back to the point where a divergence in their development first manifested itself, and tracing the farther progress of the two words step by step, assuring ourselves of the true cause of each divergence, we shall be able to decide whether their present form is the result of inner or of outside influences, and to what extent in each case.

We have already seen that the Gothic g. sg. *balgis* is possibly not formed after the analogy of the *a-* stems, but that there is a great probability that it comes from a primitive *\*balgi<sup>As</sup>*, *i. e.* is formed by the addition to the simple stem *balgi-* of the regular genitive ending *-<sup>As</sup>* without vowel augmentation, a conjecture which I am all the more ready to accept because other forms also show

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Bugge Tid. for fil. og paed. vii 320-321, who explains the umlaut as caused by the influence of following *r*. However, the form *pajar* of the inscriptions is conclusive of the presence of the *j*.

traces of the unaugmented vowel. \**Balgi*<sup>a</sup>s would give in Old Norse \**balgjar*, then in the umlaut period *belgjar*, which is the regular form of the genitive singular; the form *belgs*<sup>1</sup> is a later imitation of the g. sg. of the masc. *a*-stems, as *arms* from *armr*. The d. sg. *belg* is formed according to our first method, i. e. from *-a<sub>1</sub>ji*; \**balg-a<sub>1</sub>ji*, \**balg-iji*, \**balgi belg(i)*. The dropping of the *i* will be considered later. The n. pl. *belgir* is the regular reflection of the Gothic *balgeis*, i. e. \**balg-a<sub>1</sub>ja<sub>1</sub>s*. In the g. pl. the Gothic and the Old Norse differ widely. Gothic *balgê* can only come from a \**balg-aj-âm*, which by dropping the *j* between vowels gives \**balga-âm* \**balgâm balgê*; on the other hand, the Old Norse *belgja* can only come from the form with the unaugmented vowel \**balgi-âm*. In Sanskrit some *i*-stems show this unaugmented g. pl. as *sûty-âm*, which also appears again in the Greek g. pl. *πολί-ων* beside *πόλεων* (i. e. *πόλεων*), and in the Lat. g. pl. *avi-um* (cf. Benfey, Vollst. Gramm. §750, 4 Ausn., Bopp Vergl. Gramm.<sup>3</sup> §247). Our form *belgja* is therefore most easily explained as a direct reflexion of this unaugmented form of the g. pl. which is also found in other Teutonic dialects: O. H. G. g. pl. *gest-o*=*gesti-o* on account of the umlaut, *kesti-o* (cf. Graff IV 268), *tûti-o* (ib. V 328); O. S. g. pl. *gesti-o* (Hel. 2045), *ensti-o* (ib. 261), all of which cannot be reflexions of the Gothic *gastê* and *anstê*, but must be the form with the unaugmented vowel; the coincidence of this form with the g. pl. of the *-ja-* (*-jâ-*) stems having led to the confounding of these two classes of words. The ac. pl. *belgi*=*balgi-ns*. The Gothic d. pl. *balgim* is from \**balgi-ms*, O. H. G. *pelkim*, O. H. G. *enstim*, O. S. O. Frise *liodim* being formed in the same manner. In Old Norse and Old English the *i*-stems have lost their own d. pl. and taken that of the *a*-stems, hence *burð-um* *stôð-um* *sótt-um*, in which the radical *i* has been dropped. It is difficult to decide whether O. S. d. pl. *gestiun anstiun enstiun*, O. N. *belgjun bekkjum* are to be ascribed to the influence of the g. pl. and the *-ja-* (*-jâ-*) stems, or whether they have simply retained their radical *i* in the d. pl. after gutturals (after dentals it seems to have been regularly dropped). An explanation of the *um* in these cases as arising from *m* sonans would only be admissible on the supposition that the semivowel *j* retained its consonant nature after gutturals, but dropped out after dentals. Thus we see that the umlaut is regular in the g. d. sg., n. g. d. (in those cases retaining the *i*) and ac. pl.,

<sup>1</sup>Cl. Vig. have in g. s. only *belgjar*, cf. however Fritz. 45, Wimm. §41 b.

from whence it penetrated into all cases. To this class belong *belgr*, *gloepr*, *gestr* and others.

*Bragr* represents that class of *i*-stems which retained the augmented vowel in all possible cases and arrived at the opposite result from *belgr*. The g. sg. *bragar* arose from *\*brag-aj-<sup>As</sup>* by the dropping of the *j* between vowels; the d. sg. *brag* has employed the second method, i. e. *\*brag-aj* which would give in the first period *\*bragai*=early Gothic *balgai*, later *balga*, in the second *brage*, in the third *bragi*, later after the analogy of the other stems *brag* (cf. below for the dropping of this dative ending). The g. pl. *braga* reflects the Gothic *bragê* from *\*brag-a(j)âm*. The d. pl. *bragum* (we should naturally expect here *bregjum*) has undoubtedly followed the *a*-stems, unless we assume an early dropping out of the *j*. The ac. pl. *bragi* instead of *bregi* is at first sight quite surprising, and is generally explained as 'rückumlaut'; perhaps, however, another explanation is admissible. Accusatives like *πόλεας γλυκέας* (then *πόλεις γλυκεῖς* after the analogy of the n. pl.), Lat. *ovēis fructūs*, Old Bulg. *synovy*, i. e. *\*πόλεjas \*γλυκέFας*, *\*ovejas \*fructavas*, *\*sunavas* indicate an augmented vowel in the formation of the ac. pl., and we may conclude that the ending *-ajans -avans* was once employed as well as *-ins -uns* (cf. Leskien Dek. 79, Heinzel Endsilben 413 sq., Schleicher Comp.<sup>4</sup> 520, Bopp Vergl. Gramm.<sup>3</sup> §236 towards the end, Bücheler 54 sq.). An ending *-ajans* would explain very neatly *bragi*; from *\*brag-aj-ans* we should have after the dropping of *-ns*, the rule in Old Norse, *\*bragaja*, then *\*bragai* *\*brage bragi* regularly without umlaut. In the n. pl. *bragir* we should naturally expect umlaut, though we can here assume 'rückumlaut' after the analogy of the other cases unless we prefer an explanation to be given later.

The feminines have also employed the two methods, the one in *floeðr ermr*, provided these are really *i*-stems, which seems very doubtful, the second in *dst dstar dst(i) (dstir) dsta dstum (dstir)*. The n. pl. *dstir* has been variously explained. Leskien, Dek. 79 assumes 'rückumlaut' caused by the influence of the large number of the non-umlauting *â*-stems which have passed into the *i*-declension, but Heinzel's just objection that the Old Norse never gives up the umlaut which has once shown itself renders this theory untenable. Heinzel himself resorts to Scherer's method of non-coloring of the vowel in *-ajas*, which we have already rejected, as an *-ajas* which does not weaken its vowel to *-ijis* cannot be our *-ajais*; this would certainly give in the first period *-eir*, in the second *-ir* with umlaut.

It is true that many *â*-stems have in addition to the ending *-ar* (which is the prevailing form in the oldest MSS. cf. Wimmer § 33 B. 1.) in very early times the ending *-ir* in the n. pl., and this became the prevailing ending of later times. But if this was a real transition into the *i*-declension, why did they not take the umlaut also? Or can these *â*-stems, which have an ending completely dissimilar to that of the *i*-stems and no umlaut, have so affected the *i*-stems, to whose influence they are supposed to owe their n. pl., as to have caused them to forfeit their own umlaut? Certainly not. This non-umlauting *-ir* of the *â*- and *i*-stems (for it is here also a strange appearance) must be explained in another manner. If, then, the ending *-ir* of the *â*-stems is not borrowed from the *i*-stems, we must assume an independent development. The Greek *χῶραι*, Latin *terrae* (*ai*) are rightly explained as being borrowed from the pronominal declension (*ται*, *is-tae*). But the Skr. feminine has in the n. pl. *tās*, the Gothic *pōs*, and we were doubtful whether these forms arose from *\*tājas* by dropping the *j* or rather from *tā+as*. However, as the Greek *ται*, Lat. *is-tae* cannot possibly be a reflexion of the Sanskrit *tās*, or O. N. *pær* (on account of the *pajar* of the older inscriptions) of the Gothic *pōs*, moreover as Greek *ται*, Lat. *is-tae* must come from a primitive *tāt*, O. N. *pær* from a primitive *pājar*, and as furthermore on the other hand the Sanskrit *tās*, Gothic *pōs* can easily be explained from a primitive *tājas* by dropping the *j*, Greek *ται*, Lat. *is-tae* by apocope of the *s*, I do not hesitate to consider *\*tājas* the primitive form of the n. pl. of the fem. pronominal stem *tā-*. The *s* of the Sanskrit *tās*, Gothic *pōs*, O. N. *pær*, Lat. *his-ce quis*, Old Baktrian *viš'peš'c'a* proves the presence of the same at an early age of the language, which has been dropped in the prehistoric time both of the Greek and Latin pronoun and substantive. This removes the necessity of assuming that the *s* of these pronouns has been borrowed from the substantive. The *j* of the Greek *ται*, Lat. *is-tae*, O. N. *pājar* proves the early presence of this element in the ending. This pronominal ending *-ai-* has in Greek and Latin completely suppressed the regular substantive ending *-ās* of the *â*-stems. Whether it has also suppressed the regular one in Old Norse must remain undecided, as the ending *-ar* of the *â*-stems can come as well from *-ās* as from *-ājas* by the dropping of the *j*. However we may explain the *-ar*, the *-ir* of these stems can only be explained as a direct reflexion of the primitive form *\*-ājas -āir -ēir -ir -ir* which accounts satisfactorily for the non-appearance of the umlaut.

The Old Norse used both these endings, many nouns taking indifferently *-ar* or *-ir*, as *jarðar jarðir*, *barar barir aldar aldir sólar sólir*. The fact that the ending *-ar* is the older ending leads to the inference that the pronominal ending *-ir*, provided we regard *-ar* as coming from *-ás* and not from *-ājas*, had already at this early period begun the contest for supremacy.

From the foregoing it becomes evident that the *ā*- stems borrowed their ending *-ir* in the n. pl. from the pronoun, and not from the *i*- stems, as the *-ir* of the *i*- stems must necessarily have produced umlaut. Let us now see where the *i*- stems got their non-umlauting *-ir*. We were tempted above to explain *bragir* as 'rückumlaut' through the influence of the other cases which regularly have no umlaut, but were deterred by the fact that the Old Norse is extremely sensitive to the umlaut, which always appears in every case where there is a cause for it, as a glimpse at its *ā*- declension will suffice to show. The above fact and the still more important one that we find old *i*- stems (as *gestir gloepir* and others) with the umlaut leads inevitably to the assumption of another ending here. The feminine *i*- stems also lead to the same conclusion, and here the inducement to a change of ending in the n. pl. was much greater. We have already seen that the g. sg. (*-a<sub>1</sub>j<sup>h</sup>s*, later *-ar*) finally coincided by dropping the *j* with that of the *ā*- stems; moreover in the d. sg. the *ā*- stems early lost in most cases their *u*- (cf. Wimmer § 48) and the *i*- stems their *i*- (cf. Wimmer § 43), so that, as the ac. sing. in each case naturally became the same, the entire singular of both classes was nearly alike, which naturally had the effect of confounding the two classes of words. The ending *-ir*, which coming from the pronominal ending *\*-ājas* produced no umlaut, now began to appear in the n. pl. of the *ā*- stems, a novelty here, and soon became confounded with the umlauting *-ir* of the *i*- stems. The coincidence of the singular and the confounding of the two distinct endings in the n. pl. completed the confusion of these two classes of words. The result of this interchange of endings and identity of the singular is the present form of the *ā*- and *i*- declension in Old Norse. We shall see, however, that not all *i*- stems gave up their umlaut. The non-umlauting masculine plurals of the *i*- stems like *bragir* are undoubtedly also formed after the analogy of the n. pl. of the pronoun, as in Greek *ἱπποί*, Lat. *equi*, Lit. *vilgai*. The masc. pronominal ending was originally *\*-a<sub>1</sub>ja<sub>1</sub>s*, but became lengthened to *\*-ājas* in monosyllabic words (cf. above), hence *-eir -ir* without umlaut. As



we find both umlauted and non-umlauted forms in the masc. we must accept a later transfer of the pronominal ending than in the case of the feminines.

For the sake of clearness we will give a tabular view of the endings which have been employed in the formation of the declension of the *i*-stems in Old Norse:

Sing.	Plur.
n. -s	a <sub>1</sub> ja <sub>1</sub> s (-āja <sub>1</sub> s)
g. -a <sub>1</sub> j <sup>h</sup> s (-j <sup>h</sup> s)	-a <sub>1</sub> jām (-jām)
d. -a <sub>1</sub> ji -a <sub>1</sub> j -a <sub>1</sub> jāx	-mis
ac. -im	-ins (-a ja <sub>1</sub> ns).

All the peculiar forms of the *i*-declension both of the masculines and feminines arise from these endings; from these we can explain *belgir* (*floēðir*), *bragir* *dstir*. Let us employ the facts gathered in this investigation in the explanation of our stems, which, as we have already seen, were primitively, or became by an inner change in the course of their development old *u*- and *i*- (resp. *ā*- and *n*-) stems. It will, however, first be necessary to examine the other groups in order to see if they, too, show a disturbance in their development. If these groups, which were beyond question primitive consonant stems, have not been disturbed in their course and yet show the umlaut, then the theory of *u*- and *i*-stems will be shaken; on the other hand if they, too, have suffered inner change, or passed into another class, this theory will be greatly strengthened.

#### GROUP II.—THE WORDS OF RELATIONSHIP.

The declension in primitive Teutonic was: n. sg. *fadār*, g. sg. *fadar<sup>h</sup>s*, d. sg. *fadari*, ac. sg. *fadarm*, n. pl. *fadara<sub>1</sub>s*, g. pl. *fadarām*, d. pl. *fadarm(i)s*, ac. pl. *fadarus*. This regularly gives in the Gothic singular *fadar fadrs fadr fadar*) as the *m* being here behind a sonor is *m* consonans and therefore drops off, cf. Osthoff Morph. Unters. I 227<sup>1</sup>). The history of the plural is different. The *m* of the d. pl. and the *n* of the ac. pl. are sonantes, being protected by the mutes following, so that we therefore have d. pl. *fadrūm*, ac. pl. *fadrūns*, which two cases cause a transition of the plural into the *u*-declension: n. pl. *fadrjus*, g. pl. *fadrē*, d. pl. *fadrūm*, ac. pl. *fadrūns*, thus giving us a mixture in the declension of the nouns of relationship in Gothic, a mixture which we

shall find more or less in all the other dialects. Leaving the *a*-forms out of consideration, we find in O. H. G. for the most part consonant forms in the singular and plural, an indication that the dat. and acc. pl. did not cause a complete transition into the *u*-declension. We also find *u*-forms in the n. pl., *bruodere* (*bruodere: brôþrjus :: fuozzi: fôþjus*) Diut. III 237; in the d. pl. *bruoderen, tohteren faterin* and frequently in O. H. G.<sup>1</sup> The Old Frise has the same development of consonant and *u*-forms side by side; n. pl. *brôther brôthere*; the d. pl. offers no corresponding form. The O. S. shows only consonant forms. In O. E. *u*- and consonant forms stand side by side: n. ac. pl. *brôðor brôðru, dohtor dohtru dohtra, mōðor mōðru mōðra, sveostor sveostra* (*brêðer* is a conjecture of Grein's to Gen. 12281). The singular of the O. E. shows, however, a peculiarity not found in O. H. G., O. S. or O. Frise, viz: umlaut in the d. sg. *brêðer mêðer*, and what is more surprising *dehter* as well as *dohter*, the only form justifiable.<sup>2</sup> We shall return to these forms again. The Old Norse shows a peculiar development of this class of words. Throughout the whole plural we find umlaut and in the n. ac. pl. loss of suffixal vowel. The singular has n. *faðir*, g. *fǫður*, d. *fǫður*, ac. *fǫður* as its general declension. The oblique cases owe their present form to the ac. sg. which has dropped a final *u*, as we see from the coloring of the vowel (cf. Sievers P. B. V. 161). This *\*faðaru* can only be the reflexion of our *\*fadarm* above where the *m* has performed the function of an *m* sonans after sonors, a function which it generally performs only after mutes. Here the example of the *m* after mutes has been followed. From the ac. sg. this form has passed into the g. and d. sg. Besides this so-called regular d. sg. *fǫður* we find another, *fēðr*, which stands in the best MSS. and in the earliest times (for instance in the Homilies and early Sagas it is the prevailing form). This form has been compared with the d. sg. *foeti*, and justly, for starting from the ac. sg. *\*faðaru* these stems must also have once passed into the *u*-declension in the singular. The *u*-forms were, however, not entirely able to drive out the later analogies of the ac. sg. *fǫður*. To this fact we owe the almost total disappearance of this form in later times. In O. E., however, it is the only one. *Fēðr* then reflects the old *u*-dative *\*fadravi \*fadri vi \*faðri fēðr*.

<sup>1</sup>It must be remembered that the *u*-stems in O. H. G. have developed from Gothic n. pl. *-jus* an *i*, thus n. pl. *sunni*, and then form g. pl. *sunjo*, d. pl. *sunim* and *sunum*.

<sup>2</sup>Cf. however, Stratmann in Kölbing's Englische Stud. III 473.

These words also show *i*-forms in the Lithuanian (cf. Brugman in Curtius' St. IX 400).

#### GROUP III.—THE PARTICIPLES.

The theory of the umlaut of consonant stems finds its greatest support in the present participles, as these formerly belonged in all languages to the consonant declension. The Old Norse n. pl. *fraendr*, Old English *frýnd* is made to correspond to Gothic *frijōnds*, Old High German *friunt*, Old Saxon *friund*. This appears in fact to deal the death-blow to the theory of *u*- and *i*-stems, an inorganic umlaut being here altogether inadmissible. Let us make these stems, then, the test of the two opposing theories, but first review the forms and see if outside influence may not have been at work even here.

The participles show in Gothic, Old High German, Old Saxon, Old Frise (an exception here, as this dialect has hitherto shared the peculiarities of the Old Norse and Old English) mostly consonant forms, while on the other hand they are mostly umlauted in Old Norse and Old English. A closer inspection of these words will show quite a different story. In Old Norse the singular, having passed into the *n*-declension, will here be left out of consideration. The n. pl. has the ending *-r* with umlaut of the vowel immediately preceding, save a few remarkable exceptions, a fact all the more important as even these words umlaut in most cases. They are the following: *fjandr*<sup>1</sup> *gefandr* (cf. Gislason Tid. for fil. og paed. VI 253, Leffler, ib. n. r. II 292<sup>1</sup>. I have not been able to find the form myself), *sjandr*: *þeir menn sem eigi verða asatter um giolld skulo taka tva logseandr a meðal. sin.* Dipl. Isl. 315. *ēðr hafi þér nökkura lögsjandr til kvadda.* Eyrb. 22. *veriandr*: *svat sokendr oc heyrendr (veriandr Fr.) come til.* Post. 224. In Old English the examples of umlaut and non-umlaut are about equally divided in the d. sg. and n. ac. pl. of these stems, one author preferring one form, another the other, and sometimes we find one author using both indifferently. Here follow passages from different authors showing their preferences: Aelfred; Boeth. *hū þā ðpre friend cumað mid þām vēlam. xvi. For þām yfele pegnas beðp symle heora hlāfordes fiend . . . he him ondraed*

<sup>1</sup> I have only found this one passage with umlaut of this word, viz., *ok kvað fdt verra enn við fjandr [fjanda, K., fjendur, M.] slíka at eiga.* Fms III 214 in the Icelandic, but in Old Swedish the umlauted forms often occur, cf. Rydquest II 207.

*monigne feond* (Cott. *fýnd*). 46. *he gegæderað frind and gefêran*. 74. *Âc þa frýnd þe hine ær for þám vélan lufiað, þa geuitað eft mid þám vélan*. 106. *þa friend cumað*. ib. Aelfric: *þa þa gehwá mihte his leofostan frýnd forgytan* Hom. I 50. *þa betæhte he his fýnd góde*. ib. *forðan ðe god hi hredde við heora fýnd*. I 312, 314. *he gelaðode his frýnd and his nêhgeburas*. *His frýnd sind Engla-heðpas*. I 340. *benam his feond fríðo, gaudio omnia suis abstulit inimicis*. Ps. p. 4 in the glossary to Aelfric Grammatica. *þæt þa þinum frýnd ne helpe*. Deut. 15, 10, *Rituale Ecclesiae Dunelmensis*, ed. by Jos. Stevenson, Edinburgh, 1839, has only the *a*-forms, *feondas = inimicos* 44, 1. St. Ps. always has the unumlauted forms: *sve sve spearva se anga in timbre alne deg edvittun (l hyspton) me feond mine* 4, 8. *ofer feond his = super inimicos ejus*. 22, 24. and *svencton hic fiond heara*. 34, 42. *freond þine = sunt amici tui*. 146, 16. Maning's Supplement to Lye: *frýnd fundon* (in the Test. of Eadgifu). Laws (Schmidt's second ed.): *þonne beð he fâh við þone cyng and við ealle his fréond*. p. 142. *sþ he gefâh wið þone cyning and wið ealle his frýnd*. p. 175.

Thus Aelfred and Aelfric employed constantly the unumlauted plural (the unumlauted by Aelfric stands only in the Glossary in a citation). In Stevenson's Psalter and in the Rit. Ec. there is no umlaut, though sometimes the *a*-form. The laws have both umlaut and non-umlaut, the latter being the common form in the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle; in short, umlaut and non-umlaut stand side by side. From these forms we can draw but one of two conclusions: either the umlauting forms are the true reflexion of the Gothic *frijóns*, O. H. G. *friunt*, O. S. *friund*, in which case the non-umlauting forms can only be explained by rückumlaut, a feature quite contrary to the nature of the Old Norse and Old English, both of which languages are quite sensitive to the umlaut; or the non-umlauting forms are the regular reflexions of the Gothic, Old High German and Old Saxon forms, in which case the *a(i)* of the ending *-as* disappeared before the umlaut period. If this be so, then the umlauting forms must be explained by a transition of these stems into the *i*-declension, to the same declension to which we have seen that so many of the simple words primarily belonged, and are therefore subject to the same explanation as these. One or the other of these conclusions is inevitable unless we admit that caprice has played an important part in the development of the language, an element which has been rejected in regard to the

coloring or non-coloring of the vowel in the ending *-ajas* and which must also be ruled out here. We must also exclude rückumlaut, as there is no reason whatever for its appearance here except caprice. We have, therefore, only one choice, viz., transition into the *i*-declension. Let us see what evidence we can find for such a transition.

Even the Gothic shows signs of the beginning of a transition into the vowel declension; the g. sg. and d. pl. have here passed into the *a*-declension, and the Old High German, Old Saxon and Old Frise show a growing inclination for these forms, which finally carry the day over all others. The Old Norse, though rarely, also shows *a*-forms: *eigandar* (cf. List II 2), *gefandar* (cf. Gislason Tid. for fil. og paed. VI 253), *fjandar*, *Falli niður fjandar illir*. Ísl. þjóð. 454, *komandar*, ac. pl. *komanda* (cf. List II 65 for *komandar*, *Bidium ver alla vara aefterkomanda at halda*. Dipl. Norv. 85, 210), *smiðandar* (cf. List II 101), *skerðandar* (List II 98); *stríðandar* (List II 107) *veitandar* (List II 117); in the *boendarnar vitendar* and others of Dipl. Norv. the *a* is only the svarabhakti. Other forms show a transition into the *i*-declension. In O. H. G. and O. Frise we find O. H. G. *fianti* in the n. ac. pl., *fiantim* in the d. pl.; O. Frise n. pl. *fiande*, d. pl. *fynden*; O. H. G. n. pl. *friundi*, d. pl. *friundim*; O. Frise n. pl. *frionde*, *frionda*, *friond* (cf. List II 25, 35, and Graff 3, 382). Some of the O. H. G. forms rest on the authority of Graff, others are found in Notker; therefore there can be no doubt about the correctness of the reading. Thus two of the Teutonic dialects bear witness of an inclination to assume *i*-forms, and one of these (O. Frise) is one of the three dialects which have constantly shown the same peculiarities in the declension of their consonant stems. They both show besides, it is true, consonant forms, also a peculiarity of Old Norse and Old English. Moreover we have also evidence of *i*-forms in Old Norse: *búendir, og urðu þá ekki leingur búendir dalsins útlegu-menn*. Ísl. þjóð, II 204. *at þer waerir ok styrkir korsbroeðr till at halda þessa tyund sem nu er sagt ok oll annur sin rettynde sua ok æigsiðr þa boender sem tiundena luka þeim*. Dipl. Norv. 77, and perhaps we can also cite here the two forms of *fyrnemfdr menn* and *fyrnæmfndir Arnfinr ok Anondr* in Dipl. Norv., the first 149, the second 150. Both forms occur often in this work. *Loekendir* is found in ABC (cf. List II 53), but changed by the editor to *loekendr*, and is another example of an *i*-form. Moreover, the West Teutonic group shows a transition into the *ja*-declension



(cf. Sievers PB V 141). This transition of the participles into the vowel declension is not confined to the Teutonic alone; other members of the Aryan family shared the same peculiarity with it. In Pāli we find some cases formed after the analogy of the *a*-declension, in Old Slavonic and Lithuanian they passed into the *ja*-, in Old Prussian and Latin into the *i*-declension (cf. Bopp Vgl. Gramm.<sup>3</sup> §§ 779-780, Curtius' Stud. 5, 47, Brugman in Curtius' Stud. 9, 336).

#### GROUP IV.—THE T-STEMS.

The formation of these stems is still very obscure, the most popular explanation being by Kuhn in his Zs. I 372, Aufrecht ib. II 149, with which may be compared that of Leo Meyer in his Greek and Latin Gram. II 98, 99, and Corssen Ausspr.<sup>2</sup> II 209. These stems are supposed to have been originally consonant, belong, however, in Teutonic mostly, if not entirely, to the vowel declension. In this class are generally included such words as *haubiþ*- (= *caput*), *liuhap*-, *miliþ*- (= *μελιτ*-, Lat. *mel*, *mellis*), and others, all of which now belong to the *a*-declension. In list III of the first part of this work I have placed for convenience the following six words, without any regard to their real formation, simply because they have consonant forms and do not belong to any particular class, viz., *bajáp*-, *halap*-, *magapi*-, *mánáp*-, *mitap*-, *vítuôd*-. It is not my intention to attempt an explanation of these stems, as some of them have baffled thus far all attempts at an explanation, and even their solution would throw but little light on the present question of the umlaut. *Bajôþs* (for explanation of its formation cf. Curtius Grd.<sup>5</sup> 293, Fick VII 196, Bopp Gl. 52) has consonant forms only in Gothic, in the other dialects it follows the adjective declension with the exception of *ok þeir badr i hia uaro Besse ok Eiolfuer*. Dipl. Norv. 211, where we probably have simply an instance of the dropping of the *i* after dentals, as *badir* is the regular form even in this work. In the same manner we can explain the consonant forms of the stem *mánáp*- by the dropping out of the *i* behind dentals; it certainly has mostly vowel forms in all the dialects (cf. List III 4). *Mitap*- and *vítuôd*- are found only in the Gothic and cannot aid in our discussion. *Halap*- is connected with the root *hal* (*helan*, *hal*, *hálum*), to cover, to conceal (Lat. *oc-culum*, *cêlare*), and is probably formed by the suffix *-ta-* (*-ti-*) and therefore an *a*-stem. The forms of the O. N. *höldr*, O. S. *helið*, pl. *heliðs*, O. E. n. pl. *hæleðas* still retain their old declension,

while O. H. G. voc. pl. *helede*, d. pl. *heleden*, O. E. n. pl. *hæleðe* show a transition into the *i*-declension, probably on account of the near relation of the suffixes *-ta-* and *-ti-*. The O. E. n. pl. *hæleð* has thus lost its final vowel. *Magapi-* is an old *i*-stem and has preserved its declension in all the dialects except O. E. *mægð*, O. S. *magað*, and once in O. H. G. d. pl. *uuoroldmagadon* O. I 6, 7 (here on account of the metre cf. Ingenbleek in Q. F. 37, p. 23). The correspondence with Sanskrit *mahatī* (cf. Leo Meyer, Got. Spr. II 353) is rendered very doubtful from the fact that *mahatī* is without doubt the participle (fem.) of the praeterito-presens of Sanskrit *mañh*, thus standing for *mahutī*, from which we can not possibly get a Gothic *magaps* unless we assume that a change of *n* sonans to *a* took place at a very early date and its connection with the verb was forgotten before the Teutonic family separated from the sister languages, so that the treatment of this *a* (from *n* sonans) was the same as all other *a*'s of the primitive language. Leaving out, therefore, the three stems *bajōps*, *mitaps* and *veitvōds*, which are found only in the Gothic and have no real bearing on the umlaut question, the others all show a primitive vowel stem and only in a very few instances consonant forms.

We can now sum up the testimony given by all the groups before returning to the final decision of the umlaut question. We constantly find in all those cases in which the primitive stem was consonant a disturbance in the development of this primitive consonant stem, a constant transition into the vowel declension; in many nouns usually classed among the consonant stems we find old *u*- and *i*-stems, sometimes also *a*- (*ā*-) stems, so that in no case are we justified in asserting that an umlauted n. pl., even though belonging originally to a consonant stem, results from the influence of the *a* (*i*) in the ending *-as*; nay, more, the participles have shown beyond all doubt that the real reflexion of a consonant stem in the n. pl. cannot be an umlauted n. pl., and this testimony is further confirmed by the following n. pl. of the *Tar*-stems: *brōpr* Leif. forn. (Cod. A. M.) 83, 124, 133, and in the Hom. (we also find once in Leif. forn. the n. pl. *fōtr* and once *bōkr*, where this *ō*, however, may be the orthographic sign of the umlaut of *ō*).

Finding the primitive consonant stems incapable of clearing up satisfactorily this problem, let us try to explain the singularities of these stems considered as *u*- and *i*-stems, which, as we have already seen, give at first sight a much more unsatisfactory solution of the problem than even the consonant stems. Employing

the regular endings of the *u*- and *i*- declensions we should have in the singular :

n.	<i>fót-r</i>	<i>nótt</i>
g.	<i>fót-ar</i> (-au <sup>h</sup> s)	<i>nott-ar</i> (-aj <sup>h</sup> s) <i>noett-r</i> (-j <sup>h</sup> s)
d.	<i>foet-i</i> (-ai)	<i>nótt</i> (from <i>-aj</i> which has then been developed like the <i>ai</i> in the d. sg. of the <i>á</i> - declension ?) <i>byrig</i> (-aji)
ac.	<i>fót</i>	<i>nótt</i>

In the Plural :

n.	<i>foet-(i)r</i> (a <sub>1</sub> ua <sub>1</sub> s)	<i>noett-(i)r</i> (a <sub>1</sub> ja <sub>1</sub> s)
g.	<i>fóta</i>	<i>nótta</i>
d. pl.	<i>fót-um</i>	<i>nótt-um</i> (from the <i>a</i> - declension)
ac.	* <i>fót-u</i> (-uns) <i>foet-(i)r</i> (= n. pl.)	* <i>noet-i</i> (-ins) <i>noet-(i)r</i> (=n. pl.)

The two endings -aj<sup>h</sup>s -j<sup>h</sup>s serve to explain double genitives like *nóttar noetr*, *burge byrig* (the umlauting forms are rare in Old Norse and Old English, *byrig* being the poetical form of this word. The other words have only unumlauted genitive singulars, as *góse*, *gáte*, etc., cf. List I). The d. sg. in Old Norse has been retained by the masculines intact. Thus we find *foeti*, *fingri*, *nagli*, *manni* (following the *a*- declension in the singular), *vetri*, and by one feminine *hendi*, yet *hönd* occurs once (*til hoegri handar* [*á hoegri hönd Anm.*] Fagr. 140). The old *á*- stems, d. sg. *mörk*, *rönd*, etc., have lost their *u*, though it is sometimes retained (cf. List I), and these old *á*- stems, forming as they do the great majority of the nouns belonging to this category, have caused the *i*- stems to become flexionless in the d. sg. In Old English and Old Frise, however, we find regularly *têth*, *byrig* (= -ai -aji). The loss of the final *i* will be considered in connection with that of the n. ac. pl., both of which cases show the same peculiarity, due to the same cause. The ac. pl. early became like the n. pl. (cf. Scherer G D S, 418 sq., Blomberg, *u*- omljudet 70), for we must assume this assimilation of the ac. pl. to the n. pl. even if we consider these stems consonant, as the ending -as of the ac. pl. is not the same as the -as of the n. pl. (cf. Greek πύδας πύδες).

Thus far the endings which we have seen to have been used by the *u*- and *i*- stems in the formation of their cases have satisfactorily

explained the declension of our stems: the umlaut of the genitive singular is explained by the ending *-j<sup>a</sup>s*, the dative *têth byrig* by the ending *-auj -ji*, the n. pl. by the ending *-a<sub>1</sub>ua<sub>1</sub>s -a<sub>1</sub>ja<sub>1</sub>s*, whereas we have explained the failure of the umlaut in the n. pl. of the *i*-stems by the pronominal ending *-âjas*. Only the loss of the suffixal vowel in the d. sg. of the Old English and Old Frise and of the n. pl. of all three dialects awaits a satisfactory explanation on the supposition that they are old *u*- and *i*-stems. The evidence of the foregoing investigation bears out this supposition, which is further strengthened by the fact that we often find side by side not only these peculiar forms without the suffixal vowel and the forms according to the more general declension, but also forms in which the vowel has been retained. Thus we find *merkr markir* (originally with a difference of meaning, *merkr* signifying pieces of money and *markir* a wood, a boundary), *spengr, spangir, rendr, randir* and others. Add to these *fyrtir, hendir, noettir* (*Fostu daga eigum ver at fasta i iola fosto oc neternar*. Dipl. Ísl. 375, and often in N. G. L.), *bøtir* (*biðom wer ærfwingium hins dauða at taka sætler oc bøter af þæim*. Dipl. Norv. 350), *frender* (ath therra frender bidia them orloff, Dipl. Norv. 313, 21 of Feb. 1371 in Bergen), *broeder* (Ollum monnum þæim sem þetta bref sea eda hoeyra senda broder Asulfwer supperior ok aller adrer broeder af predicara lifnað i Oslo. Dipl. Norv. 188. *Væitum mer fyrenemdir broeder vidergonghu*. ib. 6 of Sept. 1335 in Oslo. cf. ib. 353 on the 11th of Aug. 1383 *korsbroeðer*), *merkir*. These latter forms are indeed mostly dialectical and are not to be found in the best MSS. of the Icelandic, but yet they must have been current in the mouths of the people, as the forms of the later Old Norwegian, Old Danish and Old Swedish sufficiently prove (cf. Rydqv. II, and Wimmer, Navneordenes Böjn. p. 81 sqq.). They show, moreover, the close connection of our stems with the old *i*-declension. Add to this testimony just given the former testimony of the participles in their umlauted and unumlauted forms and their identity as old *u*- *i*-stems becomes complete; the unumlauted form shows positively the form which consonant stems would inevitably have, had there been no disturbing influences at work. The Old High German and Old Saxon show in the earliest MSS. and constantly forms of the *i*-declension in all the simple words; thus we find d. pl. O. H. G. *eichin*, d. sg. *eiche*, n. pl. *enti, burgi, mûsi*, and the same in O. S. One needs only to compare the words in List I and II to see that these stems are *i*-stems in these two languages (O.

H. G., O. S.). On the other hand the participles and names of relationship show mostly consonant forms in these same languages, with now and then an *i*-form.

Let us now consider the reason for the dropping of the suffixal vowel. Two causes have combined to bring about this loss, firstly the tendency of the Teutonic to drop the *i*, the lightest of the vowels, after dentals, a tendency which the Greek and Latin also share (cf. Curtius Grdz.<sup>5</sup> 643-4, Leo Meyer Gr. u. Lat. Gramm. II 331, 532, Corssen Ausspr. II 542 ff.). And this is especially true of the Gothic, an indisputable fact as already shown in the case of *nahts*, where the evidence of five languages (cf. Curtius Grdz.<sup>5</sup> 162 and above) leaves not the least doubt of a primitive *i*-stem. *Spaurds* is also another case; it occurs only three times: d. sg. *spaurd* Cor. I, 9, 24, g. pl. *spaurdê* and d. pl. *spaurdim* John 11, 18. In O. H. G. the d. sg. is *spurt* and *spurde* (cf. List I 72), d. pl. *spurdim*. In O. E. I find in the Durham book only g. or ac. pl. *spyrdo* John 6, 19, *spyrda* Luc. 24, 13, d. pl. *spyrdum* John 11, 18, where the context gives no key to the gender. The *y*, however, (*i*-umlaut of *u*) indicates a primitive *i* in the ending. Grimm Gr. 2, 57 and Ettmüller derive our word from *spairan*, in which case we have here also a *-ti*-stem, to which the frequent *i*-forms also point. *Vaihts* bears further evidence of this tendency, showing in but one passage ac. pl. *vaihts* (cf. List I 86), in all other passages we find regularly *vaihtins*. This word belongs exclusively to the *i*-declension in the other dialects. *Dulps* is a further example, if the derivation of Delbrück Zs. f. d. phil. 1, 9 and Leo Meyer Got. Spr. § 113 from Skr. *dhṛti* is right. When we therefore consider that of the fifteen words in Gothic (*alhs bajôths baurgs brusts dulps* [gup] *mênôths miluks mitaps nahts reiks spaurds vaihts veitvôds* [pruts]) which show the peculiarities of the consonant declension, eleven of them end in a dental, and moreover that almost all of them have also in many cases retained the old forms beside the new ones: d. pl. *baurgim*, g. sg. *dulpais*, d. sg. *dulpai*, d. sg. *gupa*, g. sg. *mênôpis*, d. pl. *mênôpum*, g. sg. *reikis*, d. pl. *reikam*, d. pl. *spaurdim*, *vaihts* has almost always its *i*-forms, we need not hesitate any longer to consider these consonant forms as syncopated and not primitive ones. This tendency of dropping the vowel after dentals is also a peculiarity of O. H. G. and O. S. as seen in the following examples: O. H. G. *deoheit* (g. d. sg.), *werolt* (g. sg.) (and Wm. III) d. sg. Ct. 70 cf. Graff 1, 938 *kewonaheit teilnumft* (d. sg.), *cht* (g. sg.), *kitaat* (n. ac. pl.)



(cf. Seiler in P. B. I 439 sqq.); the following are taken from the O. H. G. Glosses ed. by Steinmeyer and Sievers: *gratiae(a) anst* 160, *potestate maht* 216, *vi maht* 265, *affinitate nahwenticheit* 433, *lessiones ungedulti* f. 225<sup>f</sup> *ungedult k* 229<sup>a</sup>, 471, *mit eocouuelihera deoheit vntaruuorfannii cum omni humilitatis subjectione*. Hat. Denkm. I 41, *potestate maht* ib. 196, *vanitas (uppigkeif) ist uuideruuertig ueritate (uuarheit)* ib. II 104, 167, but 186 *uueritate (uuarheite)*, ac. pl. *stat* = *ripas* (cf. Graff 6, 644), d. sg. *luft* R., ac. pl. *luft* Diut. II 340 (cf. Graff II 208), d. sg. *lust* N. 124 (cf. Graff. II 285). The g. pl. *gesto*, as the umlaut and the form *gestio* show, can also be added. The examples in Old Saxon are less frequent but yet we find the following: ac. pl. *dād* for *dādi* (Hel. 3236, 3480, 4420, 5153), d. sg. *hand* (once Hel. 1851 for the common form *hendi*), d. sg. *mid theru maht godes* (Hel. 4162, 4381), g. sg. *thd* for *thdi* (Hel. C. 4184), d. sg. *thiod* for *thiodi*, *undar theru thiod* Hel. 1891 and often, d. sg. *werold* (Hel. 136, 1132, 1658) for *weroldi* which is the common form, and the flexionless forms of our stems like *naht* g. d. sg. n. ac. pl., which indeed had already lost its *i* in Gothic, and *magað* = O. E. *mægð*. The Old English and Old Norse offer fewer examples of the dropping of a vowel after dentals; however, the following in Old English prove that it was not altogether unknown: d. sg. *hand*, *on anre hand* Hy. 7, 119 (cf. Grein), *tō freðn hond* Gn. Ex. 91; *miht* d. sg. *būtan þinre miht* Ps. 138, 10, *dryht*, d. sg. *fram þære sciran dryht*. Sat. 177, *mid þære meniscan gecynd*, but immediately after *mid þære meniscan gecynde*. Blick. Hom. 121, *from þære thd ā oð æfen*. Alfred's Beda 391, *be þære ceorliscan bōt* Alfred's laws in supplement to Beda 35 (p. 31) and *heafod punde to bot*. ib. 40. In Old Norse this tendency manifests itself chiefly in the d. sg., which, together with the dropping off of the *u* in the d. sg. of the *ā*-stems as already noticed above, serves to account for the frequency of the flexionless dative singular in Old Norse (see examples of both kinds in Wimmer § 52, 1, § 33, 2).

It is not only after dentals that we find this disappearance of the characteristic vowel. It occurs also after other consonants though less frequently. Thus we find a few cases where it has disappeared after gutturals, a feature which the Greek and Latin also share, though many of the examples given need to be considered with care, being of a very doubtful nature. For the Greek we refer to Curtius Grdz.<sup>6</sup> 171, who gives *aʔξ* as an example of this kind, coming according to him from *\*āγt-*, but Möller K Z 24, 482, 512 rejects

this as impossible and considers *ag-* the stem, explaining the *ay* as *i-* epenthesis. Other examples are to be found in Curtius St. 5, 77 f., Kühner ausf. Gr. Gram. I 383, 387, Bopp Vgl. Accentuations sys. 172: ἀλκ- for ἄλκι (cf. Curt. Grdz.<sup>5</sup> 132, Delbrück Zs. f. d. Phil. I 133), χροῖξ for χρόκι- πτόξ, Hom. πτόχες (cf. Curt. Grdz.<sup>5</sup> 529) and others, all of which are very doubtful. For the examples in Latin I need only refer to Corssen Ausspr. II 204, 589 sq., where the question is thoroughly discussed, and Gustav Meyer in Curt. St. 5, 55 sqq., who devotes some space to the investigation of this question. The Teutonic furnishes but few examples of this nature, as the vowel clings with greater tenacity to its existence after gutturals than after dentals. In Gothic it is exceedingly rare where we can with any degree of certainty conjecture that a vowel has dropped out after a guttural, yet the following stems may have lost their characteristic vowel: *ahs* (cf. O. N. *ax*, O. E. *aechir*, O. H. G. *ahir*; cf. Leo Meyer Got. Spr. § 180, Brugman K. Z. 24, 10), *hugs* (g. sg. *hugsis* for \**hugasas*, from an *s-* stem \**hugas*?), *veihs* (Skr. *vêṣa-s*, Gr. *οἶζο-ς*, Lat. *vacu-s*, O. H. G. *wîch*, pl. *wîcha*=*vîcos*, O. E. *vîc* (n). Kelt. *fich* (cf. Curtius Grdz.<sup>5</sup> 749), *peihs* (cf. Leo Meyer Got. Spr. § 46). To these doubtful examples we can add the following, which the forms of the other dialects seem to render more certain: *alhs*? (Lat. *arx*, stem *arc-* or *arci-*? cf. Delbrück Zs. f. d. Phil. I 133, Curt. Grdz.<sup>5</sup> 132), *baurgs* (all the other dialects show an *i-* stem; cf. List I 12), *miluks* (O. N. *mjólk* is also consonant, but in O. E. and O. H. G. the *i*-forms prevail; O. E., however, has sometimes *meolc* instead of *meolce* in the d. sg.), *reiks*? (n. pl. *reiks*=Old Indian *-râḡas*=Lat. *rêgês* [cf. Leo Meyer Got. Spr. § 191] occurs twice; see List I 63). This word seems to defy all explanation (cf. Corssen Ausspr. I 448 sqq., Curt. Grdz.<sup>5</sup> 185, and Möller K. Z. 24, 455). The connection with Skr. *râḡan-* ruler, Lat. *rêx* is evident, whether we explain the *i* as an *i*-epenthesis with Möller (ib.) or in one of the numerous other ways proposed, the only question here being the original declension of the word in Gothic. In Skr. are to be found the three stems *râḡan-*, the form of the simple word. In compounds we find *-râḡa-* and *-râḡ-*, the latter occurring occasionally independently (cf. B. R. 6, 313; Grassmann wb. z. Rgv. 1157). In Latin we also find two stems: *rêg-* and Osk. *rêgo-* (cf. Corssen II, 448), and the *regi-* used in compounds which is probably weakened from *rego-*. The difficulty in Gothic lies in determining which was the original stem, the *reikā-* of the g. sg. and d. pl., or the *reik-* of the n. pl. The absence of this word in the other dialects cuts off

all means of a comparison, and we must leave the question still undecided. And yet one might conjecture from *baurgs* and *miluks* that *reiks*, which has more vowel than consonant forms, had also lost its characteristic vowel. It may, however, be an original consonant stem just passing into the vowel declension. We shall touch upon this point later. The Old High German offers still fewer examples: *pruah* (cf. List I 18), the d. sg. *burg* beside the regular form *burgi*, g. pl. *burgo* beside *burgio*. If Paul's conjecture (P. B. VI, 115) is right, O. H. German *fahs*, Gr. *πέφος*, also belongs here. The only example afforded by the Old Saxon is n. pl. *wrk* for *wiki* (Hel. 3700, Cot. *wiki*), probably here on account of the following vowel. The only case of the kind in O. E. would be the above mentioned d. sg. *meolc* for *meolce* and *ricu ricum*, *sêc* (cf. Sievers P. B. V. 13), to *daeg* Alfred's Beda 261, *oð to daeg* ib. 275. In the d. sg. of the Old Norse, however, we find a great number of examples: *mög* for *megi* S. E. I, 268, *lög* for *legi* S. E. I, 694 (probably here to avoid hiatus), *styrk* for *styrki*, *streng* for *strengi*, *serk* for *serki*, *rykk* for *rykki*, *reyk* beside *reyki*, *merg* beside *mergi*, *fnyk* beside *fnyki*, *belg* for *belgi* and others. We find this same peculiarity also in the imperative (2 sg.) of the weak conjugation, where the *i* of dissyllabic stems with long vowels has been dropped (cf. Sievers P. B. V. 132, Heinzel Endsilben 54 (394), Leffler Tid. for fil. og. paed. N. R. 2, 268, Bopp Vgl. Gramm.<sup>2</sup> § 719). Thus *berg* (*\*bargi*) *fylg* (*\*folgi*) and others (cf. Wimmer § 142). The same principle is seen at work in the n. sg. of words like *loekr*, *ylgr*, *sprengr*, which have dropped their *i* (from *ja-jâ*- stems cf. Sievers P. B. V. 129) after gutturals (cf. Heinzel Endsilben 51 (391)).

We see by the examples that this peculiarity of the loss of the vowel after gutturals manifests itself in the various dialects, though sparingly, and we may justly ask under what conditions, for most of the cases point to the same general cause. Its frequent occurrence in the d. sg. of the Old Norse might lead to the supposition that the analogy of the *i*- stems as in d. sg. *gloep gest* and others where loss of vowel seems to be the rule (cf. Wimmer § 46, 51, 2 and often) had been at work here, were it not for the strangeness of this feature even in the *i*- stems. We must, therefore, seek the cause in a more general law and one that will cover all cases, and this we shall find by admitting that the auslautsgesetz, though only in a very small number of cases as we have already seen, has overstepped its prescribed limits. It is well known that in dissyllabic words with a long radical syllable (accented) followed by a syllable

containing *a e i*, this short vowel disappears. Furthermore, if a long vowel stands in the ultima after a long radical syllable (accented), it becomes shortened. Now an *a e i* which has become shortened in this manner may be, though it rarely is, dropped, as we have seen in the case of *bend* (*bandi*), *sêc* (*sôki*) and the other examples of the disappearance of an *i* after dentals and gutturals as cited above. It is to this transgression of the law that these so-called consonant stems owe the loss of their characteristic vowel, for by comparing list I it will be seen that all the words have a long radical syllable with the exception of *dyrr* (pl.) *hnot stoð*, which are surely analoga. In the same manner the final unaccented *a e i* of trisyllabic words disappear (cf. Sievers P. B. V, 155) and a final long vowel (unaccented) of such a trisyllabic word would become shortened and finally disappear, as in the case of the dissyllables, so that the nouns of relation and participles could also be brought under this rule, unless one can imagine that the few dissyllabic words among them have been able to draw the rest into their analogy. The Old High German also shows other instances of this same transgression of the law after *r*, *s* and *l*; *gîr*=*vultures* Diut. II, 286, *gîri* Diut. II, 85, *steingeisz*=*ibices* Bib. 7, *steingeizi* Ma. (Graff IV, 286), *hornuz*=*scrabones* beside *hornissi* (cf. Graff IV, 1039), ac. pl. *nagal*=*clavos* A. (Graff II, 1017). A second reason why this transgression might take place is the consideration that most of these words are either the names of domestic animals or of members of the body, or in fact words that are of most frequent use, a fact that must have greatly facilitated the shortening of their vowel in time to render them liable to fall under the working of the *auslautsgesetz* before its activity had entirely ceased. The above investigation clearly proves that all the Teutonic dialects have joined in overstepping the primary limits of this law.

In conclusion we can say that this inclination to drop this light vowel *i* (shortened from *î* and weakened from *a*) still continues in Icelandic, for instance we find in the n. pl. of *brú* *brýr* (formerly *brúar* though *brýr* occurs once in the XIVth cent. cf. List I 17), *gnit*, pl. *gnitr*, kind pl. *kindr*. Yet on the whole the Icelandic has retained the old declension of these words, whereas the Danish and Swedish have entirely driven out the syncopated forms, so that we now find only *mærker*, *hænder* *næter* etc, which should cause no surprise, since as far back as the XIVth cent. we find the unsyncopated forms

in quite general use and the syncopation in these dialects has not been as general as in the Icelandic.

The question now naturally arises whether there still remains even a small remnant of the old consonant stems among the simple words as we have seen that there is among the participles and words of relationship in several dialects. There are a few words in which we might justly doubt whether they were primarily consonant or vowel stems, viz., guttural stems like *flik spik tik vik* and the Gothic *reiks* above discussed. The most common forms in the declension of these words conform to every requirement of the consonant declension, and the collateral forms of some of the cases (cf. these words in List I) could easily be explained as beginnings of a transition into the vowel declension. It is the same question touched upon in the discussion of *reiks*; there is no possibility of deciding whether the vowel or consonant forms of these words are primary, and, as we have seen, an explanation is possible on the assumption either of consonant or vowel stems. The other dialects throw no light upon the question, and perhaps we should be justified in assuming in most if not in all cases a later analogous formation after the model of *noetr*, etc. It is, however, different with the forms of the n. pl. *meðr (teðr) kiðr* which Tamm in P. B. VII 448 claims as consonant forms; for if the conditions for the transition of *v* to *ð* be immediate contact with the following *z*, we could not possibly explain the umlaut unless we assume that this transition took place very late (i. e. after the umlaut period had begun its activity), which Tamm himself denies. This did not, indeed, escape Tamm, who finally concludes that these rare and mostly poetical forms are only later formations after the analogy of *buðr ruðr* etc. (cf. ib. 452 sqq.).

The results, then, of this investigation can briefly be summed up as follows: (1) the consonant stems are still retained (partly at least) in the names of relationship, in some forms of the -ND-stems, and with less certainty in some *Tar*-stems; (2) there arose in Teutonic a peculiar declension caused by the twofold diversity in the development of its *i*-stems which resulted in Old Norse, Old English and Old Frise in forming two distinct classes of words; the loss of the characteristic vowel, in which some *u*-stems joined, widened the breach and created such a divergency between these two classes of words that they were no longer to be recognized as belonging to the same original declension. The old consonant stems, which had already suffered an inner change by which they



had passed into the *u*- or *i*- declension, now joined the latter class, and thus a declension was formed showing characteristics not to be reconciled either to a regular development of the consonant declension, nor yet to that of the *u*- or *i*- declension, but only to be explained by first accepting for the old consonant stems a transition into the vowel declension, and, then, for all, syncopation of the characteristic vowel.

. S. PRIMER.

### III.—TÓUKVÆDHI.

AN ICELANDIC POEM FROM C. 1650.

The accompanying poem, now for the first time published, is contained in numerous paper manuscripts preserved both in Iceland and in the library of the Icelandic Literary Society at Copenhagen. The present text is transcribed from a series of manuscripts in Reykjavík, one of which states the author to have been Hallgrímur Pétursson (1614-1674), the celebrated divine and psalm-writer, to whom it is also assigned by popular report. In the biographical account of Hallgrímur Pétursson contained in vol. III of the *Hist. eccles. Isl.*,<sup>1</sup> where he is described as "*Omnium iudicio poëta et orator eximus, cujus ingenii foetus, praesertim poëmata, quamdiu Islandia durabit, pariter durabunt,*" the list of his published works, entirely of a religious character, concludes with "*Ut et multa alia profana, quae inedita adhuc latent,*" to which class the present poem doubtless belongs.

The poem is a rhymed fable in which the *dramatis personae* are a fox—variously called *tóa*, *skolli* and *rebbi* (diminutive of *refr*),<sup>2</sup> a cock—*hani*, and a cat—*kisa*, or *ketta*. The fox trotting along the road sees a cock, whom he greets, imploring him, at the same time, to remove with his bill a straw from his eye, telling withal a plausible story as to how it had gotten there, and flattering the cock's appearance, voice, and skill as a physician. The cock, however, flies up into a tree, from where he avows his distrust in the friendly intentions of the fox, but is finally persuaded to come down by the latter, who welcomes him and quietly bites off his head. At this instant a cat comes along, who greets the fox and asks the news. The fox suggests that they hunt together, but the cat says that on the way she had seen some berries just out of reach in a high tree ;

<sup>1</sup> F. Johannaes. *Historia ecclesiastica Islandiae*. Havniae 1772-78.

<sup>2</sup> The fox has a multiplicity of names, as will be seen from the following verse cited in Maurer's *Isl. Volksagen* :

Refr og hóltapórr, melrakki, dratthali, bítr,  
blóðækkur, tortrygg, lágfæta, skolli, tóa.

hereupon the fox asserts his superior strength and skill, and offers to assist in getting the berries. In the midst of the conversation dogs are heard barking and the cat climbs hastily up into the tree, from which, crouched on a limb, she sees the fox killed by the dogs, but finally manages, herself, to run home. The moral of the story stated in the last verse is in effect the Biblical aphorism of the wicked falling himself into his own pit.

## LANGUAGE.

The language had already materially assumed the form characteristic of modern Icelandic. Viewed from the stand-point of classical Old Norse, the language of the poem exhibits the following universal changes:

## I.—Vowel-changes.

*ó* with preceding *v*, representing an earlier *vá*, is shortened: *vonum* 14 *voru* 24 *svo* 29 for O. N. *vónum* (*vánum*), *vóru* (*váru*), *svó* (*svá*). *ó* is shortened in the personal pronoun *honum* 1, 14 for O. N. *hónum* (*hónum*).

*i* in the possessive pronouns *mínn*, *þínn*, *sínn* is shortened before *nn* and *tt*, but remains before a single *n*: *mínn* 21 *mitt* 11, 23 *sínni* 17 *sítt* 1, 8, but *mínum* 3, 18 *þínu* 2.

*e*, *ø* (and also *a*, *i*, *u*, *y*) are lengthened before *ng*, *nk* to *ei*, *au* (*á*, *í*, *ú*, *ý*): *skeinkt* 3 *ölfaung* 3 *gaunga* 18 *laungum* 25 for O. N. *skenkt*, *ölföng*, *gönga*, *löngum*.

Adjectives in *-ligr* and adverbs in *-liga* change the *i* to *e*: *mjúklega* 16 *fallega* 26 for O. N. *mjúkliga*, *falliga*.

Adjectives (and pronouns) in *-igr* change the *i* to *u*: *geðugum* 5 from *geðugur* for O. N. *geðigr*.

*ú* = negative, is everywhere replaced by *ó*: *óvart* 2 *ódygg* 10 *ólat* 21 for O. N. *úvart*, *údygg*, *úlat*.

A *u* is inserted in the new language before every *r*-final preceded in O. N. by a consonant: *gæddur* 5 *frægstur* 5 *tregur* 9 *sjálfur* 12 *daufur* 15 *kemur* 16 *grunur* 22 for O. N. *gæddr*, *frægstr*, *tregr*, etc. This new *u* does not work umlaut, *i. e.* does not change a preceding vowel: *angur* 1 *aptur* 21 *kraptur* 21 *falskur* 29 not *öngur*, *öptur*, etc. In *fagurt* 8 the new *u* is retained throughout the flexion.

## II.—Consonant-changes.

Old Norse *k*- and *t*-final are softened to *g* and *ð* in the following instances: (1) *k* becomes *g* in the pronouns *eg* 2, 3 etc., *mig* 4, 9 etc., *þig* 2, 9 etc., *sig* 26, in *og* (and) 3, 6 etc., and in *mjög* (very) 28 for O. N. *ek*, *mik*, *þik*, *sik*, *ok*, *mjök*; (2) *t* becomes *ð* in the pronoun *við* 19 (and *þið*) for O. N. *vit* (*þit*), in ntr. -að, -ið, -uð of adjectives (participles) and pronouns: *augað* 2 það 4, 14 etc., *galað* 8 *hóað* 24, *rekið* 2 *logið* 11 for O. N. *augat*, *þat*, *galat*, etc., in *að* 2, 3 etc., as adv., prep. and conj. and its compounds for O. N. *at*.

Old Norse *rr*-final is everywhere simplified to *r*: *ber* 29 for O. N. *berr*.

*j* is retained before *i* where it was previously dropped: *hverjir* 11 for O. N. *hverir*.

Dual and plural of the personal pronoun coincide, the plural forms being used indiscriminately of a duality: *okkur* 12 *við* 19 are correctly used dual forms; *oss* 19 *yður* 22 are plurals used as duals.

*Er* 9 1, pers. sing. pres. indic. of *vera*, esse, for O. N. *em* is formed after the analogy of the other forms sing. and plur. of the indic. pres.

*Tóukvæði.*

1. Tóa tölti um stræti  
til þess hana sá,  
honum heilsar þá  
bað sitt ángur bæti:
2. "Eg í augað hefi  
óvart rekið strá  
bið því burt<sup>1</sup> að ná  
þig með þínu nefi.
3. Kom eg að kaupstað einum,  
keypti eg ölfaung þar,  
skeinkt á skálir var  
mér og mínum sveinum.
4. Þá vèr þaðan fórum,  
það eg ekki dyl,  
þá bar þetta til,  
mig eg meiddi stórum.

<sup>1</sup>i. e. *braut*—*brott*—*brot* finally by metathesis *bort*—*burt*.

5. Þú ert gáfum góðum  
gæddur, utan skrum,  
frægstur af fuglunum  
með geðugum<sup>1</sup> gildum hljóðum.
6. Veiztu eiktir<sup>2</sup> allar  
einkum morgna á  
raust þín hvell og há  
fólk á fætur kallar.
7. Læknislist<sup>3</sup> frábæra  
lært hefir þú, er sagt,  
á því hefi eg akt<sup>4</sup>  
kongs með krónu<sup>5</sup> skæra."
8. Haninn fjaðrir hristi,  
hátt í eik<sup>6</sup> þar sat  
fagurt galað gat,  
lof sitt heyra lysti:
9. "Tregur er eg að trúá  
tóa mín á þig,  
senn þú svíkur mig:  
við heilt er best að búa.
10. Af því sumir segja  
sèrtu fáum trygg,  
lymsk í lund, ódygg,  
vön til vèla' að teygja."
11. "Hverjir þvætta þetta?  
þeir hafa orðskemt<sup>7</sup> mig,  
en logið því í þig,  
á bak mitt brigzlum sletta.
12. Þú munt sjálfur sanna  
svikalaus trú,  
kom og kyss mig nú;  
gjörum okkur gamna."

<sup>1</sup> *geðugur*, engaging, winning.

line is "thou knowest all times of the day."

<sup>2</sup> *eikt* i. e. *eykt*, trihorium; the sense of the

art of medicine.

<sup>4</sup> *akt*, act, certificate.<sup>3</sup> *læknislist*, medicine, the<sup>5</sup> *króna* = O. N. *krúna*.<sup>6</sup> *eik* literally *oak*, but as is usually the case so also here generically *tree* [20, 25].<sup>7</sup> *orð-skemma*, to word-damage, slander.



13. Haninn heimskur trúði,  
háleitur og gól,  
hennar þóknast hól,  
í skjól við skolla flúði.
14. Fór það víst að vonum,  
veik sèr tóa að,  
"kom þú sæll,"<sup>1</sup> hún kvað;  
höfuð beit af honum.
15. "Aví,<sup>2</sup> ertu dauður,"  
annsar<sup>3</sup> tóa þá,  
"falílalilá,<sup>4</sup>  
beint sem bitinn sauður."
16. Þá hún er þetta að tala,  
þar sem haninn lá,  
kemur kisa þá,  
mjúklega tók að mala.
17. Heilsar systur sinni  
svipljót kisa þá,  
frèttir mörgu frá,  
grett í gráu skinni.
18. "Alt var heilt á hófi  
heima á mínum stað";  
tas-vig tóa kvað,  
þreytt af gaungu þófi:
19. "Við skulum frænka<sup>5</sup> fara  
að fá oss villibráð,"  
það fær kisa tjáð:  
"eg mun ei það spara.
20. Fann eg á förnum vegi  
fagra eik og há,  
uxu<sup>6</sup> ber þar á,  
en þeim náði' eg eigi."
21. Annsar rebbi aptur:  
"ólat kann eg ráð;  
fæ eg fljótt þeim náð,  
minn er meiri kraptur.

<sup>1</sup> *kom þú sæll* = "welcome!" the usual address to one who comes. <sup>2</sup> Interjection. <sup>3</sup> i. e. *ansar* [21]. <sup>4</sup> Interjection. <sup>5</sup> i. e. *frækna*. <sup>6</sup> For older *óxu* [*vóxu*].

22. Á því er mèr grunur,  
að yður sè meira veitt,  
en eg kann ei utan eitt;  
það er mikill munur.
23. En ef ráð mitt eina  
orkar meira' en þín,  
það er meining mín,  
þá skal þetta reyna."
24. Sem það voru að segja  
sín á milli tvær  
hóað heyrðu þær;  
hvellir hundar geya.
25. Ketta klærnar þandi  
klyfrar<sup>1</sup> hátt í eik,  
laungum lymisk í leik,  
laus frá lífsins grandí.
26. Hún sig þar upp halar;  
hundar tóu ná,  
—fallega fór hún þá—  
drepín var án dvalar.
27. Kísa upp á kvísti  
köldum spent var móð,  
ýlgð og stuttleit stóð,  
hala og eyrun hristi.
28. Hrædd var mjög við hunda  
í hnípri saman lá;  
fèkk því færi á  
heim til húsa að skunda.
29. Er það einginn vafi,  
einatt<sup>2</sup> svo við ber,  
"falskur sjálfum sèr  
grefur<sup>2</sup> gröf, þó grafi."

WILLIAM HOWARD CARPENTER.

<sup>1</sup> i. e. *klífrar*.<sup>2</sup> i. e. *einart*.

#### IV.—THE NEGATIVE PARTICLE "MIE" IN OLD FRENCH.

In the earliest known monuments of the French language the negative used to qualify the verb is the simple particle *non* or *ne*. Up to the close of the Xth century this particle had the same force as the Latin negative *non*; but owing to causes which as yet have not been satisfactorily explained, it seems in the XIth century to lose part of its first vigor, and requires in many cases a complementary particle to make it a full and complete negative. The particles so used, of which *mie*, *pas*, and *point* are the most important, were originally positive, as is evident from their derivation. Their signification, which indicates a very small quantity, made them especially appropriate to strengthen the idea of negation contained in the *ne*, and the one chosen most frequently by early authors to fill this position is the particle *mie*. *Mie* is derived from the Latin *mica*, a crumb, which already in Latin had received an extended meaning and was used to denote a very small quantity of anything, e. g.

Nullaque MICA salis, nec amari fellis in illis  
Gutta sit; . . .

MARTIAL, lib. VII, epig. 25.

The first example of this word in French, as far as I have been able to ascertain, is in the "Fragment de l'Alexandre d'Albéric de Bésançon," a work attributed to the latter part of the Xth century, and given by Bartsche in his "Chrestomathie de l'ancien Français," p. 18, line 32. In this sentence, viz.

S'il toca res qui MICHAL peys  
tal regart fay cum leu qui est preys.

*mica* is used as an adverb and *positively*. This circumstance, although it is only the second one of its kind I have been able to find, seems to indicate that these particles *mie*, *pas*, *point*, etc., originally substantives, were used as *adverbs* in a *positive* sense, and under this influence lost their distinctive meaning, and were then joined to the negative to strengthen its influence. Another argument in favor of this supposition is the fact that from their

earliest appearance in the language as complements to the negative, these particles are joined to any verbs indiscriminately, and not to those alone which express the same generic idea; as "ne manger mie," "ne marcher pas," etc. This, however, is not the opinion of grammarians in general. Gilles in his work on the negation in French (Bruxelles, 1877), p. 38, says: "Ce mot (*mie*) sans doute figura d'abord dans des propositions négatives dans lesquelles ce substantif se rapportait à un corps solide et particulièrement à du pain," and gives in illustration of this the following example taken from the "Livre de Job," "se ele ne sospiret ne manjout mie." Now this work is attributed to the XIIth century, and in the Ch. de Roland, which belongs to the XIth century, *mie* is used indiscriminately with any verb. Also the example quoted above from "l'Alexandre" shows that *mie* was not necessarily joined to the negative and that it was not a substantive. To this may be added the following from the Chanson de Roland, v. 3897:

Tut seie fel se io mie l'otrie,

where *mie* is used as an *adverb* and unaccompanied by the negative. In the absence therefore of proof positive to the contrary I should be strongly of the opinion that *mie*, *pas*, *point*, etc., were used as adverbs positively at first, and then added to the negative when through some cause or other its full force was not conveyed by the particle *ne*.

In this respect it may be interesting to follow the development of the use of *mie* as a complementary negative from its first appearance in the XIth century down to its disappearance from general use about the close of the XVth century. For this purpose I have taken three works as representatives of three periods, viz. "La Chanson de Roland" for the XIth, Villehardouin's "Conquête de Constantinople" XIIIth century, and "La Farce de Maître Pathelin" for the XVth century, and compared the use and frequency of *mie* in each of these works. The "Chanson de Roland," as every one knows, contains about four thousand lines of ten syllables each. The "Conquête de Constantinople" put in the same shape would number about six thousand lines, and the "Farce de Maître Pathelin" about sixteen hundred lines of eight syllables. In the "Chanson de Roland" *mie* is found about forty times and is used five times before a noun, as v. 3182:

Il nenat mie de Roland sun nevold;

three times before an adjective, as v. 140:

De sa parole ne fut mie hastif;

twice before an adverb, as v. 2724:

Dist, Clarien Dame, ne parlez mie itant;

six times with a participle, as v. 3563:

Lor enseignes niunt mie ubliees;

four times followed by an infinitive, as v. 1973:

L'enseigne Carle ni uolt mie ublier;

twenty times with a verb alone, v. 494:

Altrem't ne mamerat il mie.

Carles se dort mie ne sesueillet—v. 736.

In the "Conquête de Constantinople" *mie* is found one hundred and twenty-eight times, and is used fifteen times with a noun, e. g. p. 72-128:

Et ce ne fu mie mervolle;

eleven times with an adjective, e. g. p. 118-205:

Et ne furent mie pou;

forty-one times with an adverb, e. g. p. 128-223:

Ne dura mie longtemps;

eighteen times with an infinitive, e. g. p. 104-183:

Ne convient mie a parler;

thirty times with a verb alone, e. g. p. 112-194:

Qui ne m'aiment mie;

thirteen times with a participle, e. g. p. 156-266:

n'ere mie eslongniez.

In the "Farce de Maître Pathelin" *mie* is only found twice, viz. in the following examples:

He deu, se vous avez mesprises

Une fois ne souffit-il mie.

(p. 43, ed. Jacob.)

Or n'en croyez rien

Car certes ce ne suis-je mie.

(p. 78.)

From this it will be seen that *mie* was fast coming into general use in the XIth century, and had risen to its greatest popularity in the XIIIth, only to give way from that time down to *pas* and *point*, and finally in the XVth century to be on the point of disappearing completely from the written language.

B. F. O'CONNOR.



## NOTES.

### *JE NE SACHE PAS, AGAIN.*

In the second number of this Journal (Vol. 1, p. 197), I published a note on the French so-called dubitative subjunctive, *je ne sache pas* in the principal clause; and in the fourth number (Vol. 1, p. 460), Mr. A. Lodeman criticized my theory, which claimed an indicative origin for this *sache*. My reply, prepared several months since, has been kept back by press of other matter.

Mr. Lodeman first takes me to task for saying by implication that *je ne sache pas* was equivalent to *je ne sais pas*, and adds: "but whoever has observed how Frenchmen use the phrase in question, knows that such is not the case." When I gave it to be understood that I regarded the two expressions as virtual equivalents, I acted on the authority of the French Academy, in whose dictionary the following note occurs, under *savoir*:

"*Je ne sache personne*, je ne connais personne; *je ne sache rien de si beau*, *je ne sache rien de mieux écrit*, etc., *je ne sais rien*, *je ne connais rien*" . . .

To assure myself, however, that I had put the right interpretation upon these words, I consulted a native professor of French, whose opinion is paramount to all non-native speculation. He coincided with me in my understanding of the Academy's teaching, and added further that he himself could not feel any difference between *je ne sache pas* and *je ne sais pas*; that the former was an indicative in force, if subjunctive in form, and he did not believe that any one could really say there was an appreciable difference between the two.

This is implied in the fact that *je ne sache pas* is rarely, if ever, heard in every-day life, although Mr. Lodeman would lead us to infer that the expression is daily heard from the lips of natives. The need of it is not felt and its use is considered pedantic. These circumstances seriously militate against his words that "this distinction is universally felt and recognized by Frenchmen," and that "in the case of this verb [*savoir*] French-speaking people feel the need of a still milder form of expression."

In the second place, Mr. Lodeman thinks I did not do justice to Littré, when criticizing his teaching with reference to the derivation of the form *sache*. Let us see whether such is the case.

According to Littré, some one had maintained that *sache* was the indicative "représentant *sapio*." And his rejoinder to this was: "L'explication (namely, that *sache* represents *sapio*) ne peut être admise, car *sapio* a donné *sai*; et *sache* vient de *sapiam*," which is a mere assertion and no proof. I, therefore, can not see what violence I did to Littré's words by taking them in the most obvious sense. Moreover, we are by no means so certain that *sapio* gave *sai*. My reasons for doubting this may be partially found in my former article. I briefly sum them up here with some additions. The common resultant in French of a lip-sound followed immediately by a palatal *i* is a *consonne chuintante*; we should consequently expect *sache* from *sapio*; whereas *sai* was formed on the French infinitive *savoir*, or on a Romance form *sapo*, which probably went through *savo*, *sav*, *saiv*, to *sai*. *Sapo* is not merely hypothetical; it occurs in early Italian, and gave *so* through *savo* (I have found *savere* and *savete*), *sao*.

Again, Mr. Lodeman is "inclined to think" that in pronouncing purely conjectural Mr. Littré's explanation of *je ne sache pas* by a preceding *j'ose dire*, I "overlooked" the quotation from Paré: "Aussi osé-je dire que je ne sache homme si chatouilleux," etc. To this I reply that I considered the explanation so trivial as not to be worth noticing. If any "overlooking" has been done, Mr. Lodeman is the offender, not I; for Littré expressly says, when referring to the sentence in Paré: "*On peut conjecturer* que ceux qui les premiers l'ont employée ont sous-entendu: *j'ose dire*," etc. Consequently what I said was only a translation of Littré's own words.

Further on, Mr. Lodeman declares that the uniqueness of the construction *je ne sache pas* is not very startling to him, and that its peculiarity consists in the tense and not in the mood. But it is precisely in the latter that the difficulty lies. If the expression were *je ne susse pas*, it would not be so hard to explain. Being a present tense, I fail to see its analogy with *non dixerim*, Greek optative with *ἄν*, etc.; for *non dixerim* and *οὐκ ἄν λέγοιμι* have their analogy in *je ne dirais pas*, where there is suppressed some such protasis as: *si on me demandait mon opinion*. And so German: *ich wuesste nicht* (i. e. *wenn man mich fragte*); whereas it would be no more logical to understand a protasis with *je ne sache pas*

than with *je ne sais pas*. If we could say in German *ich wisse nicht*, the analogical argument might have some force ; as it is, it has none.

Mr. Lodeman continues: "In French too, the conditional (according to Diez, a tense of subjunctive mood) of various verbs is used to express an affirmation doubtfully," and cites as one of the examples: *Je ne saurais vous le dire*. Then right in the next sentence he contradicts himself by saying that *je ne saurais* has the meaning of *je ne puis, je ne peux*, which certainly is not a doubtful affirmation.

And again, I do not understand Diez to teach that the conditional is a "tense of the subjunctive." My edition of Diez at least reads: "Vermoege derselben methode schuf man ferner mit *habebam* ein zweites tempus, *das seiner bedeutung nach ungefaehr dem lat. imperfect des conjunctivs entspricht*"; and that practice had established the name *conditional*, "weil es im bedingungssatz eine rolle spielt, wiewohl dieser name nichts weniger als zutreffend ist."

In treating of the conditional Mr. Lodeman says that the use of *sache* and *saurais* (= *je ne puis, je ne peux*) seems to have originated about the same period, *i. e.* in the XVIth century, as he accepts Littré's theory. Here I am sure Mr. Lodeman stands alone ; and he may continue to believe he is right ; what I object to is that he should use his own oversight as an argument against me. If he had given himself a little trouble, he might have ascertained that, in more than one of the Romance languages, from a very early date, *savoir* in most of its moods and tenses has been interchangeable with *pouvoir*.

Examples:

Ahi Dio, che sembra quando gli occhi gira ?

Dicalo Amor, ch'io nol *saprei* contare.

(Guido Cavalcanti, XIII cent.)

Assez en *sauroie* nommer.

(Guiot de Provins, *La Bible*, bet. 1203 and 1208.)

Here *saprei* and *sauroie* are used exactly as they are at the present day. In lines 1431 and 2138 of *La Bible*, *sauroie* has the force of *porroie*. The same usage in Joinville's *Histoire de Saint Louis* (chap. 134): . . . se il ne savait aussi hardiement et aussi durement escondire comme il *sauroit* donner.

And so in Provençal:

Que fesson devezir,  
A cui que mielh taisses,  
Que cascus nom n'ages  
Per so que *saupra* far.

(Guiraut Riquier, XIII cent.)

As instances of *savoir* for *pouvoir* in other tenses may be noted:

Une chalur ki pas ne se *seet* atemper.

(Math. Paris, Vie de Seint Auban.)

A si *sabe* dar omildança a Alfonsso so señor . . .

(Poema del Cid, l. 2024.)

A se lograr da paz com tanta gloria

Quanta *soube* ganhar na dura guerra.

(Camoens, Os Lus. III 118.)

Take it all in all, I have not been able to discover what bearing this whole discussion of the conditional has on *je ne sache pas*. I have only referred to it, in order to expose the fallacy of Mr. Lodeman's reasoning, and to show him that with the early Romance peoples, as with the Teutonic (Goth. *kunnan* and *kannjan*, Eng. *ken* and *can*, Germ. *kennen* and *koennen*, etc.), our trite adage, 'knowledge is power,' was a deep-felt reality.

Mr. Lodeman seems to attribute to the verb *savoir* some peculiar meaning. What this meaning is he does not tell us. What is there specially significant or mysterious in *savoir* that is not contained in *connaître*? If Frenchmen so universally feel the necessity of toning down *je ne sais rien* into *je ne sache rien*, by the "softening" process, so much insisted on by Mr. Lodeman, I can not see why the same necessity has not been felt of putting *je ne connais rien* through the softening mill and making it *je ne connaisse rien*. Moreover, if Mr. Lodeman's theory be true, why is not *nous ne savons pas* softened to *nous ne sachions pas*? There would be more reason in this; for a speaker in giving his own opinion could be more sure of his knowledge than when representing the thoughts and feelings of the individuals contained in *nous*, and consequently a less direct mode of expression could be reasonably expected.

I come now to the closing paragraph of Mr. Lodeman's communication. As I distinctly stated, in summing up, that I laid no great stress on what I said in respect to a double inflection of the present tense of *savoir*, it was hardly worth his while to criticize it. However, in his eagerness to score a point against me, he puts down *sappia* as the imperative of the Italian *sapere*, apparently not knowing that it was not the imperative, but the third person of the subjunctive, which, in Italian proper, is the polite form of address of all verbs. Without entering here into this subject of imperative and subjunctive, it is sufficient to remark

that in view of the multitude of forms and of the uncertainty as to the origin and growth of these forms, it would be rash in any one to express a too decided opinion regarding any individual form, without a careful and prolonged study of its history.

In the next sentence Mr. Lodeman makes a statement which, I am sure, will prove a new revelation to most scholars, namely, that "not a trace is left" in Italian of a second form of the indicative present. The early oracles of the language, as seen in the following citations, tell a different story:

Questo è mio giuoco ed altra giuocar non *sappo* (= so).  
(Guittone d'Arezzo.)

E che si fesse rimembrar non *sape* (= sa).  
(Dante, Par. XXIII 45.)

E *sapemo* (= sappiamo) che amore privato ismisuramente chiude l'occhio del cuore.  
(Ammaestramenti degli Antichi).

Lo Trebuno lo mandò in Cesaria, *sappiendo* (= sapendo) ch'egli era voluto torre da' Giudei.  
(Domenico Cavalca.)

Same form of the gerund in Boccaccio, Nov. 42. Nay more, the very form I had assumed as the natural Gallic outgrowth of *sapio*, I find to be quite common in early Italian.

Non *saccio* (= so) vero consiglio alcuno che il vostro.  
(Guittone d'Arezzo.)

Temo morire e già non *saccio* (=so) l'ora. (Boccaccio).  
Con un *saccente* (=sapiente) barattiere si convenne del prezzo. (Boccaccio).

These surely may be called traces of a second, and even a third form of the present indicative of *sapere*.

Continuing his theme of the identity of the imperative and subjunctive of *savoir*, *sapere*, Mr. Lodeman asks if this exception is not attributable rather to the meaning of this verb, "which," he says, "does not admit of an imperative in the same sense as the majority of other verbs." Unfortunately for this theory, it seems never to have occurred, even unconsciously, to the French people, to fit whose delicate sensibilities it was created; for at the time they were making their language, when only it would apply, we find them using the regular indicative form.

*Saivez* ke deus ait an covant  
A ceaz ki se vorront creusier.  
(Chanson de Croisade, XII cent.)

Seignor, ce dist li rois, *savez* que je vous di.  
(Berte aus grans piés, 2598.)



On the other hand, is the subjunctive a milder imperative than the indicative? I think not. The Latin subjunctive had already acquired an imperative force, before the Romance peoples fell heir to it. (*Vos*) *amatis me*, therefore, must have seemed to them a milder form of command than (*vos*) *amētis me*. In English we observe the same mode of expression when we say *you do this*, or *you will do this*, instead of the abrupt *do this*.

SAMUEL GARNER.

#### VARIA.

I.—*Parodies and Resemblances*.—In the fourth number of this Journal I called attention to the resemblance between Aristoph. Acharn. 790 and Soph. Antig. 513, not venturing positively to pronounce the former a parody on the latter. I am now convinced that it is not a parody upon that particular passage, but is a sort of παρατραγῳδία. The mode of expression found in the two verses seems to have been a common one, so common that absolute identity of words would have been requisite, perhaps, to remind the audience of any particular verse that they had heard. Accordingly, I find in Euripides a verse which is, in some respects, more like the verse of Aristophanes than is that of Sophocles. It is Iph. Taur. 800:

ὦ συγκασιγνήτη τε καὶ ταύτου πατρός.

If now we compare v. 497:

πότερον ἀδελφῶ μητρός ἐστον ἐκ μιᾶς;

and the two verses under discussion:

ὁμαιμος ἐκ μιᾶς τε καὶ ταύτου πατρός—

ὁμοματρία γάρ ἐστι καὶ τῶντῶ πατρός—

and bear in mind that the Iph. Taur. was probably produced after the Acharn., it becomes almost certain that the expression in question was merely a species of circumstantiality frequently employed by those who affected lofty speech. (Cf. Herc. Fur. 843, Phoen. 156. In Nub. 1372 ὁμομητρίαν is used for a special reason.) If this expression were found only in the Acharn. and the Iph. Taur. it would probably be regarded as sufficient grounds for placing the latter chronologically before the former, an illustration of the caution necessary in attempting to draw conclusions from limited data.

II.—*A Fragment of Euripides*.—Stobaeus gives in the *Florilegium* a certain passage, consisting of eighteen iambic trimeters, as belonging to Menander; and Buttmann, Reisig, and Meineke maintained that this was correct, whilst Henri Estienne, followed by Bentley and others, assigned the first three verses to Menander and the rest to Euripides. But the latest decision of most critics was that the first *two* verses were from Menander, and the rest from a tragedian, not necessarily Euripides. (Gaux in *Rev. de Phil.*, vol. I, p. 210–11.) Now Choricus gives (*Apol. Mim.* VII 4) a portion of this passage beginning just where Estienne claimed that the Euripidean part commenced, and at the end he says: ἀκούεις ἀνδρὸς μισογύνου καὶ σόφρονος—of course, Euripides. Of the fifteen tragic verses Choricus gives six, but between the third and fourth he has a verse not in Stobaeus, making seven in all. The passage then runs thus:

τὸ μὲν μέγιστον οὐποτ' ἄνδρα χρὴ σοφὸν  
 λίσαν φυλάσσειν<sup>1</sup> ἄλογον ἐν μυχοῖς δόμων·  
 ἐρᾷ γὰρ ὅψις τῆς θύραθεν ἡδονῆς,  
 ἐρᾷ δ' ἀκούειν ὧν φυλάττεται<sup>1</sup> κλύειν,  
 ἐν δ' ἀφρόνοισι τοῖσδ' ἀναστρωφωμένη  
 βλέπουσά τ' εἰς πᾶν καὶ παροῦσα πανταχοῦ,  
 τῇν ὅψιν ἐμπλήσας<sup>1</sup> ἀπήλλαχται κακῶν.

Of the fourth verse Gaux says: “Dans la citation de Choricus est intercalé un vers que n'a pas l'extrait de Stobée.” He cannot mean that it was added, but that it is interpolated relatively to the extract of Stobaeus, from whom he says Choricus probably took the passage, it being at that time properly assigned. This would imply that the verse in question was accidentally dropped by subsequent copyists of Stobaeus, and also that they omitted the name of Euripides. It is tolerably certain, however, that Stobaeus himself took many of his extracts from a similar collection made by some predecessor; and in copying this passage he failed, perhaps, to note the author, and, misled by the repetition of ἐρᾷ, omitted the verse found in Choricus; whilst the latter, copying, in my opinion, *from the same original*, did not commit either blunder.

But I have written this more especially to call attention to the fact that, with the new verse, the transition from ἐρᾷ γὰρ ὅψις to

<sup>1</sup> Gaux says nothing about φυλάσσειν, φυλάττεται.

ἐρᾷ δ' ἀκούειν (sc. γυνή) is hard. It seems possible that some one—say the author of the work from which Stobaeus and Choricus copied—assuming that in v. 7 ὄψιν must refer to ὄψεως in v. 3, changed the latter into ὄψις, so that the shade of meaning might be the same, failing to observe that the next verse would then suffer a change of subject. I merely suggest these views for the consideration of others: I would not propose to “emend.”

III.—*Caesura in Euripides*.—In an article on certain effects of elision, published in the Transactions of the American Philological Association for 1879, I have shown that Euripides virtually never neglected the main caesura in iambic trimeters. Only three exceptions were noted, one of which, Hel. 86, being a conjecture, was rejected. That investigation did not include the Cyclops nor the fragments. It is my purpose now to examine the subject again. The examples in Dindorf's text of verses without caesura or its equivalent (in addition to Hel. 86) are, as far as known to me, the following:

- (1) Suppl. 303: σφάλλει γὰρ ἐν τούτῳ μόνῳ, τᾶλλ' ἐὼ φρονῶν.
- (2) Cycl. 7: Ἐγέλαδον ἰτέαν μέσῃ θενὼν δορὶ—
- (3) Frag. 284, 23: στάς. ἄνδρας οὖν ἐχρῆν σοφοῦς τε καὶ αἰσχροῦς—
- (4) Bacch. 1125: λαβοῦσα δ' ὠλέναις ἀριστερὰν χεῖρα—
- (5) New frag. (Blass): ὀρθοσταθὼν, λόγχαις ἐπιείγοντες φόν[ον].

The first and fourth are the exceptions alluded to before. In the *Revue de Philologie* II 1, p. 37, Herwerden has rejected the first for other than metrical reasons. Its suppression seems so nearly justifiable that it cannot be admitted as a genuine exception. In the example from *Cyclops* I have (in this *Journal*, No. 2, p. 190) restored the MS reading ἐς ἰτέαν (with synizesis). The third example is the work of Musurus, the verse being defective in MSS. Dobrée proposed ἄνδρας οὖν χρῆν τοὺς σοφοῦς, which has at least the merit of being possible. In the article just referred to I expressed a temptation to write ὠλέναις in the fourth example, a temptation that is increased by the fifth example, which has been discovered since I discussed the subject; for it is certainly striking that this verse should admit the quasi-caesura by exactly the same device. Some able grammarians maintain, indeed, that it would be absurd to add -ι to the dative plural in the first and second declensions merely for the purpose of eliding it; and this is true in almost every situation except this one; but in this case I have

shown that the vowel must have been sounded a little. And hence it is that the canon relating to the elision of *-i* in the dative plural in Attic can have no weight in settling this question. The *-i* is not essential to these forms, and the only objection to assuming its elision is the one just referred to, and, as I said, that objection does not hold in the present case. To this it may be replied that Homer elides the *-i* of the third declension but not of the first and second. But this would be to beg the question. If Homer does not elide in the first and second declensions, it is because the forms without final *-i* were in use. Moreover, in Homer *-ης* and *-οις* nearly always precede a vowel; so general indeed is this fact that Nauck attempts to remove all the exceptions. While he probably goes too far in this, still there is good reason for writing *-ης* and *-οις* before vowels.

But there is another standpoint from which the subject must be viewed. The fact that in all the plays of Euripides there are so nearly no instances of neglected caesura is a ground for believing that these instances are either only apparent or erroneous. But would this argument not apply also to elision of *-i* in the dative plural? Let us see. We must confine our investigation to those positions where it is necessary to assume elision. One of these is at the end of the third foot when there is no break of any kind in this or the following foot. The elisions of this sort in Euripides (excluding the dative plural) are one hundred and twenty-seven (127) plus the number in the fragments; and the dative plural occurs twice in that position. These being the only instances of supposed absence of caesura, it follows that the above argument against neglected caesura is more weighty than the same argument against elision of the dative plural, in proportion as the entire number of iambic trimeters in Euripides exceeds 127 + . There is one other place where elision is desirable—at the so-called Porsonic pause, when the well-known law seems to be violated (see article above mentioned). The instances of this elision, as far as “emendations” have not prevented me from finding them, are, in all the tragedians, *thirty*, in Euripides alone, *twenty-three*; and there is *one* verse in which elision of the dative plural would excuse the neglect of the law: Ion, 1:

\* *Ἀτλᾶς, ὁ χαλκίζειι νότοις ὀδρανόν—*

where Ritschl and some others thought the words were intended to labor in sympathy with the toiling son of Japetus, a notion unworthy of the great philologist. This whole passage, however,

has been emended, or rather rewritten, by Dindorf; and others have in different ways altered the first verse. The second requires some change, but the first would probably be let alone but for the violation of Porson's law.

All of these suggestions are merely tentative. I should not venture to write *-αισ'* and *-οισ'*, and yet I am not willing to admit the verses under discussion as exceptions to the observance of caesura, even if we assume (as has been done in this whole discussion) that the verses in question are not in some way corrupt. This is, however, by no means certain. If in Bacch. 1125 we change *ὠλέναις ἀριστεράν* into *ὠλέναισι δεξιάν*, the caesura is restored without impairing the sense; in fact, the situation is rendered more appropriate. Why then should Euripides have selected "left" rather than "right," thereby introducing what we must in any case concede to be an unusual license? Compare, too, the account of Ovid (Met. III 708—731) which agrees in the main with that of Euripides: in the latter, *Agave λαβοῦσα . . . ἀριστεράν χεῖρα . . . ἀπεσπάραξεν ὄμρον*, and *Ino τὰπὶ θάτερ' ἐξεργάζετο βηγνῶσα σάρκας*, whilst in the former, "*dextram precanti abstulit* (sc. *Agave*); *Ino lacerata est altera raptu.*" (Cf. Heracl. 844.) But how could *δεξιάν* get changed into *ἀριστεράν*? I cannot give a perfectly satisfactory answer. Some one may have written *ἀριστεράν* or *ἀριστερά* on the margin to explain *τὰπὶ θάτερ'* four lines below, and this may have found its way into the wrong verse. To assume what has been called a *heterophemy*, or rather what might be called a *heterography*, would perhaps look too much like catching at a straw.

In Blass's fragment (see Rhein. Museum, 1879, p. 290 ff., Rev. de Phil. IV 2, p. 121) *λόγχαις ἐπείγοντες φό[νον]* may have come from *λόγχαισι τείνοντες φόνον* (sc. *εἰς αὐτούς*: cf. Heç. 263). I have also thought of *πράζοντες* and *ποριῶντες*. Five lines below, where the narrative returns to the subject of *ἐπείγοντες*, we have *οἱ δ' εἰς τὸν αὐτὸν πίτυλον ἤπειγ[ον δορός]*, *πέτροι τ' ἐχώρουν κτέ.* This may have led to the substitution of *ἐπείγω*, in the verse in question, for some verb bearing no special resemblance to it. This, however, is hazardous, and apart from the wanting caesura there seems to be no good reason for attempting an emendation.

Here I let the matter rest, with the hope that others will examine these verses, and also cite any more of the same sort that I may have overlooked. It would not be worth while, however, to pay any attention to instances which are the result of rash conjecture. In my discussion I have referred only to those which Dindorf thought



worthy of a place in his text. If we undertake to scrutinize the conjectures of all, there is no end to the task before us, and no limit to the absurdity that we shall encounter. An "emendation" of J. H. Hogan, for an instance, gives us an example of a verse (Med. 1349) without caesura, thus:

οὐ παῖδας οὐδ' ἐθρεψάμην καὶ ἔφευσα (!)

Nor is any regard to be had to lyric hexapodies, for they have no caesura. Freund (Trien. Phil. V, p. 198) cites, as an example, Eur. Troad. 1305:

γερατά τ' εἰς πέδον τιθεῖσα μέλαινα (!)

He should have given the antistrophic verse where the MSS contain a real example.

M. W. HUMPHREYS.

#### A GREEK INSCRIPTION CONCERNING GOLGOL.

An inscription on a statue in the Cesnola Collection is interesting in view of Vogüé's guess as to the locality of Golgoi. Hagios Photios, where Cesnola discovered the temple and the sculptures within and outside of it, is twenty minutes' walk, I am informed by General Di Cesnola, from Hagios Georgios, the site of the ancient grave-yard. The edge of the latter is only ten minutes' walk from the temple. It is in this graveyard that the statue was found, a seated woman whose left hand rests on a box held in the right hand of a small figure standing at her left side—all in the limestone of the place. It is known in the Cesnola Collection as No. (Inscr.) 164, i. e. in the Series of Inscriptions No. 164. The inscription is on the base and declares the sculptor; it is Greek and in three lines:

Ζωίλος

Γόλγως

ἔποιεῖ

The shapes of the letters assign it to the Roman age of Cyprus, for *E*, *Σ* and *Ω* are in the round forms *ε*, *ς*, *ω*; *Π* has both legs equal; and the extremities of all the letters flare a little. The *O*'s are smaller than the other letters. *Ζωίλος*, as Renan points out (see *Mission de Phénicie* index) may be the translation of a Semitic name; at any rate it is much commoner in Semitic countries in their Hellenized age than in Hellas proper. It occurs on two

other monuments of the Cesnola Collection, two burial cippi from Kition. The statue has never been published; it was discovered in 1875, was part of the second collection and remained packed in its box till 1879. A fac-simile of the inscription will be given in the forthcoming photographic atlas of the Cesnola Collection.

A. DUNCAN SAVAGE.

OF late years a fashion has come into vogue of inserting a negative between the infinitive and its prefix, e. g. "to not do it," "to not obey," etc. Like all linguistic changes it seemed to spring up in a night, no one knew whence or how: it would generally be explained, I presume, as an Americanism. A reference to Bishop Pecock's Repressor (about 1450), one of the great landmarks of our older English prose, will show that this usage was not unknown during the first half of the XV century. See Repressor, p. 467, "It is notably better to be had, than to not be had."

H. E. SHEPHERD.

## REVIEWS AND BOOK NOTICES.

### RECENT WORK IN ASSYRIOLOGY.

The study of the Assyrian language has been hampered with peculiar difficulties, quite apart from those occasioned by the cuneiform text. Not only have the vagueness and insecurity so widely attaching to Semitic philology been felt with special force in this new department, but the unexpected richness of its yield for geography and history and religion dazzled scholar as well as layman, and the demand of the latter for more and more knowledge of results which he could appreciate found a response in the constant readiness of the former to popularize what he had found. This over-eagerness of scholarship has in part vanished,—none too soon. It was perhaps inevitable, and the wide interest which it fed has contributed in material ways to the advancement of knowledge; but while it lasted it of course hindered the progress of patient, scientific investigation, and it has left superficial habits in many quarters which can hardly be eradicated. It is this influence, as well as loose notions of Semitic languages and their laws, in both England and France, that, joined with a defective method, have prevented the one like the other from taking that part in the work of reducing the Assyrian to a science which the brilliant services of both as discoverers and epigraphists might have led us to expect. In this less captivating, but indispensable and rewarding task, the German Assyriologists have easily taken the lead. The stimulus given to this phase of activity has come in part from an inward impulse toward thorough knowledge, but in large part also from the attacks of unsympathetic scholars upon Assyriology as a whole. The first systematic treatment of the language that is here to be mentioned,—Schrader's *Assyrisch-Babylonische Keilinschriften* (1872),—was due to such a cause, and the coldness of Nöldeke, Lagarde, and others toward the Assyrian has been the spur to the yet closer demonstration of the facts and more rigid application of linguistic laws which mark the present era of Assyrian study.

The centre of Assyriology is now the group of scholars at Leipzig, with Friedrich Delitzsch at their head. Schrader indeed still commands universal respect, but the work which first gave him his reputation was done when the materials were far more meagre than now, and his attention of late has been largely devoted to matters not purely philological,—the results of his valuable studies in history and geography (*Die Keilinschriften und die Geschichtsforschung*, 1878) are of course only incidentally available for the student of language. It is true that his paper *Ueber die Aussprache der Zischlaute im Assyrischen*, of which more presently, was a positive and great contribution to Semitic philology, but for the causes mentioned, or for others, no school of Assyriologists has formed itself around him in Berlin. That at Leipzig is, if not the only one, at least the only one with such a controlling scientific method. The French students of the inscriptions are slowly shaking

off the influence of Oppert and Menant,—learned, but self-confident and biased—and that of the brilliant, versatile, superficial Lenormant, but they are not yet free from it. In England, with opportunities such as no others have had, the foundation for Assyriological work has in most cases been far too narrow, and the method (of assertion rather than demonstration) has been fatal. It is much to be regretted that the Leipzig school stands thus alone, for it will almost inevitably be regarded by conservative and suspicious Semitists as a small society for mutual admiration, in the absence of any strong, united confirmation of its results, and, still more, its principles, from other learned centres. Besides, the danger is not small that the Leipzig school, pushing its work with no independent *group* of scholars in the same field, which in learning, enthusiasm and method can approach it, will make mistakes from which timely and forceful criticism might save it. The present outlook, however, is hopeful.

Since the outlines of the science were clearly mapped out by Schrader, the conviction rapidly gained ground that the next duty was, not to attempt further presentations of the grammatical system as a whole, but to prepare the way for such a presentation by minute study of the materials. To this end Delitzsch prepared his *Assyrische Lesestücke*, whose 2d edition (1878) has proved so indispensable to the student. This well-known work need not be reviewed here. The only criticism of its general plan and execution would regard the absence of references to prove the phonetic and ideographic values of the characters in his "Schrifttafel," but this lack, rendered almost necessary by the practical limit to the size of the volume, was largely compensated for by the accurate reproduction of syllabaries and bilingual texts. The book is, as all students know, simply invaluable. Since its appearance he has published comparatively little, but he has not been idle. His enthusiasm and tirelessness have made the "Leipzig school" possible. It would be a sufficient merit to have trained and stimulated men like Haupt and Lotz. But besides this, their works have been subjected more or less to his revision, and are enriched with notes from his hand, and the press will soon show that his personal studies have not been remitted.

The next demand upon Assyriology was plainly to secure, if possible, some definition of principles. Any one who is at all familiar with the superficial comparison of roots, the wild license of etymologies, the conclusions easily and confidently drawn from *approximate* identity of sounds, which were so long regarded as appropriate to Semitic philology, as they certainly were peculiar to it, will understand the need of a clear understanding as to what was and what was not possible for one Semitic dialect over against another. The confusion was nowhere greater than among the sibilants, and here the beginning of order was introduced by the treatise already named,—Schrader's *Aussprache der Zischlaute im Assyrischen*, read before the Berlin Academy, March, 1877. This treatise furnished in detail the proof that the original Semitic *š*, which was retained in Babylonia down to the Persian period, gradually became *s* in the pronunciation of Assyria, so that the appearance of *s* for *š* in proper names, etc., borrowed by the Hebrew from Assyria is simply explained. The Hebrews spoke and wrote שָׁרָן, for example, though the first element of the name was really *š*, because they heard it so pronounced by the Assyrians. From this conclusion Hommel (now of Munich, but a Leipzig student) advanced, in

the excursus appended to his *Zwei Jagdinschriften Asurbanibals* (1879), to a comparison of the sibilants (and dentals) of all the Semitic dialects. This pamphlet, and Haupt's review of it (Z. D. M. G. 1880, IV), enable us to form a table of correspondences, depending on physiological laws, and therefore without exceptions.

Primitive Semitic	HOMMEL.	$\bar{d}$ .	$\bar{d}$	$\bar{z}$	$\bar{t}$	$\bar{t}$	$\bar{s}$	$\bar{s}$	$\bar{s}$	$\bar{t}$	$\bar{t}$	$\bar{s}$	$\bar{d}$
	HAUPT.	$\bar{d}$ .	$\bar{d}h$	$\bar{z}$	$\bar{t}$	$\bar{t}h$	$\bar{s}$	$\bar{s}$	$\bar{s}$	$\bar{t}$	$\bar{t}h$	$\bar{s}$	$\bar{d}$ (?)
Arabic.....		$\bar{d}$	$\bar{d}$	$\bar{z}$	$\bar{t}$	$\bar{t}$	$\bar{s}$	$\bar{s}$	$\bar{s}$	$\bar{t}$	$\bar{t}$	$\bar{s}$	$\bar{d}$
Aramaic.....		$\bar{d}^1$	$\bar{d}^2$	$\bar{z}$	$\bar{t}^1$	$\bar{t}^2$	$\bar{s}^2$	$\bar{s}^1$	$\bar{s}$	$\bar{t}$	$\bar{t}$	$\bar{s}$	
Ethiopic.....		$\bar{d}$	$\bar{z}^2$	$\bar{z}^1$	$\bar{t}$	$\bar{s}^2$	$\bar{s}^1$	$\bar{s}^2$	$\bar{s}^1$	$\bar{t}$	$\bar{t}^2$	$\bar{s}^1$	$\bar{d}$
Hebrew.....		$\bar{d}$	$\bar{z}^2$	$\bar{z}^1$	$\bar{t}$	$\bar{s}^3$	$\bar{s}^1$	$\bar{s}^2$	$\bar{s}$	$\bar{t}$	$\bar{t}^2$	$\bar{s}^1$	$\bar{s}^3$
Assyrian.....		$\bar{d}$	$\bar{z}^2$	$\bar{z}^1$	$\bar{t}$	$\bar{s}^3$	$\bar{s}^1$	$\bar{s}^2$	$\bar{s}$	$\bar{t}$	$\bar{t}^2$	$\bar{s}^1$	$\bar{s}^3$

\* Later, s.

† Later,  $\bar{z}$ .

‡ Later, s.

Both Hommel and Haupt attempt to construct the sibilant and dental system of the parent Semitic language. Their results do not wholly agree, and both must be regarded as tentative merely, but the correspondences in the historic dialects, with which alone we can directly deal, may be considered established, and therewith an enormous stride is taken toward a rational, scientific Semitic philology. The value of such a fixed, mechanical law can be appreciated only by those who know the fancies of etymology to which the absence of it has given rise.

But a still more important work than this of Hommel was Haupt's *Die Sumerischen Familiengesetze* (1879). Not only is the fixed correspondence of sibilants and dentals confirmed, but precise correspondences are postulated, and at least in part established, for the other consonants. In addition to this, the book contains a wealth of new discoveries, acute criticisms, bold, but well sustained positions, which established at once its character as one of originality and power. Its prime intention, as conveyed in the title, is the translation, with commentary, of the non-Semitic column of a bilingual tablet, with a view to initiate scientific treatment of this non-Semitic language,<sup>1</sup> but with the further object of gaining new light for the Assyrian. And indeed the brief inscription of six lines forms the nucleus for a mass of linguistic and philological details. It is impossible to enumerate them. The demonstration of the value  $\bar{s}a$  for the conjunction "and," in the Sumerian (Akkadian), the pointing out of a genetic connection in that language between the notions "flow," "speak," "call" (name), Akk.  $m\bar{e}$ , and that of "existence," the great number

<sup>1</sup> For the helps to its study, and a survey of important facts in regard to it, see Hommel, *Die Neueren Resultate der Sumerischen Forschung*, ZDMG. xxxii (1878) I.

A discussion of Haupt's *Akkadische und Sumerische Keilschrifttexte*, Lief. 1-3, (1881), would be premature, but there is much significance in the implication (see the title and elsewhere) of two non-Semitic languages or dialects in Babylonia. Their existence is demonstrated by Haupt, *Nachrichten der Gött. Ges. d. W.*, Nov. 1880. Any treatment of these and other facts concerning the Akkadian and Sumerian, though indispensable to a full outline of Assyriological work, must be omitted here.



of Akkadian derivatives in the Assyrian and other Semitic languages, the multitude of new readings for characters and words, the proof that the Assyrian vowel, written by French and English Assyriologists as *e*, but by the Germans hitherto as *i*, is not modified from *i* by the influence of an adjacent guttural, but is developed out of the older Semitic *d* (for its transcription Haupt adopts *ē*), a modification parallel with that in Hebrew of *δ* from the same *d*, these are a few examples which may explain in part the great influence of the book and the high position among Assyriologists it at once secured for its author.

Another book, imbued with the same spirit, but different in scope, is Lotz's *Inscripfen Tiglath Pileser's I* (1880). This too is a work of the highest order. The cuneiform text is indeed not given, but the transcription is careful, the variants stand in the margin, the translation is close and accurate. The commentary and glossary occupy two-thirds of the book, and every page rewards the student. One of the most striking discoveries is that of the true meaning of *susu* (Heb. סוס, "horse"). The considerations in virtue of which Lotz translates it in Assyrian by "elephant," set this meaning fairly above the grade of mere probability, though perhaps less can be claimed for the reading *mur-nišku* of the hitherto unpronounceable ideogram for "horse." But far beyond the value of its particular demonstrations is the pervading tone of thoroughness. Mere conjecture is given as such. Positive statements are attended by proof. Hasty inferences, superficial generalizations, are not to be found. The work is well fitted to impress the long-needed lesson, that in Assyrian as little as elsewhere can earnest, patient discussion be dispensed with, and that no man's opinion is worth a straw to his fellow-students unless it rests on grounds which he is willing to subject to their tests.

In other countries there are several recent commentaries on extended texts. In France, Pognon has subjected the Bavian inscription of Sennacherib to a careful study (*L'Inscription de Bavian*, 1879-80). His work is an immense advance on any similar commentary in French. It is in two parts, the first containing text, translation and notes, the second appendices and glossary. The great value of the book is impaired by the absence of a transcription of the text. At this stage of Assyrian study it is quite as important to *pronounce* the words accurately as to translate correctly. Lotz's method would therefore have been better, since the text is already accessible (III R. 14), and corrections or variants could have been easily supplied. Of course, if space were not too precious, it would be a convenience to have the transcription in *addition* to, not instead of the cuneiform text, but the transcription we ought by all means to have. For the rest, the notes contain much valuable suggestion. The pronunciation *ma* (not *va*) of the Assyrian enclitic conjunction, and its identity with the Ethiopic particle *ma* (pp. 72, 162) he has recognized simultaneously with Haupt and Lotz, but independently of them, and in other points his views carry weight because he supports them with evidence. It would be too much to expect that he should be wholly free from the faults of his predecessors and associates, and he is not so, yet he often shows a wise divergence from them. The second part of his book will be noticed below, but a word may be given here to the remarks on the Assyrian alphabet prefixed to the glossary. Pognon recognizes *Ṣ* as the only aspirate and (rightly?) denies the existence of *ṣ* in Assyrian. He notices, but not fully enough, the passage

of *a* into *ē*; indeed the whole treatment of this latter so often misrepresented vowel is unsatisfactory. After studying Haupt's demonstration (*Sum. Fam. Gesetze*, S. 65 ff.) one will hardly agree with Note 2, p. 106: "On sait que la voyelle *ē* provient ordinairement de l'alteration d'un *i* primitive." Further, any statements as to the influence of the adjacent guttural in producing the vowel *ē* (*ē*), see p. 155, must be made with great caution, and the theory that all signs representing a syllable with *i* represent those with *ē* as well, so that, e. g. *ni* can also be read *nē* (pp. 105 N, 161) is untenable. The apparent interchange resulted from the loss of distinction in sound between *i* and *ē*—a very different matter. The hypothesis (p. 162) that *a, i, u*, followed by a vowelless *m* or *n* had a nasal sound analogous to that in French is improbable and needless. There is no special treatment of the sibilants. Leaving Pognon it is not necessary to do more than name *Documents Juridiques de l'Assyrie et de la Chaldée*, by Oppert and Menant (1877), and the frequent publications of Lenormant, before passing to England.

Budge's *History of Esarhaddon* (1880) is a modest and meagre contribution to Assyriology. It is in the old style, made familiar by George Smith, but utterly without that penetrative genius which in Smith atoned for so much that was lacking. It is a plodding bit of work—at many points, of course, the advances in knowledge appear—with little keenness, small grasp, no trace of original investigation. All the notes are in the vocabulary, which contains no references to text or translation, so that the notes, such as they are, are of the least possible use, and from their character one might naturally suppose that the chief object of Assyrian study was to find parallels with Hebrew roots. The undertaking was so falsely conceived, and executed with so little breadth and so little scholarly acumen and force, as to make it of no consequence whatever for philology. Worse than this, it perpetuates vicious traditions of method, and is thus a positive hindrance to the growth of better habits.

The labors of Sir Henry Rawlinson and of Pinches, indefatigable as they are, are hardly philological. They are decipherers; in that direction lies their genius, and on that field they have won and are still winning their well-earned laurels.<sup>1</sup>

The Assyrian Grammar, as already said, has not yet been written, for neither Schrader's "ABK" (1872) nor Sayce's *Assyrian Grammar for Comparative Purposes* (1872) could be regarded as final, while Sayce's *Elementary Grammar* (1876), with all its merits and defects, is a mere schoolbook, and Menant's *Manuel de la Langue Assyrienne* (1880) shows little appreciation of the progress of the last ten years. A grammar by Haupt is promised, and will be eagerly looked for. Meanwhile, the morphology of the verb is gaining in clearness. Since Hincks (*Journ. R. As. Soc.* 1866) observed the "Permansive Tense," and Geldart discussed it (*Oriental Congress*, London, 1874) and Sayce treated it more fully (*Journ. R. As. Soc.* 1877) it has been generally accepted. That it is a secondary and not a primary formation in the Semitic was announced by Sayce (*ib.*) and argued with care by Haupt (*ib.* 1878), and whether or not

<sup>1</sup>Attention should be called to the appearance of Vol. V, Plates 1-35, of the *Cuneiform Inscriptions of Western Asia*. It contains, among other important inscriptions (many of them bi-lingual) the Decagon Cylinder of Assurbanipal (R<sup>m</sup> I), with restorations from duplicate fragments, and the Babylonian Cylinder of Cyrus.

there are still those who doubt it, the fact grows more certain all the while. As to the distinction between the Imperfect (Present or Future) and the Aorist (Past tense formed by prefixes) it is necessary to criticize only the mode of statement adopted by Sayce and Pognon (Part II). They are both inclined to believe (Pognon too hesitatingly) that the doubling of the 2d radical in the Present Qal is for the *eye* only, to show that the previous vowel is accented, and this being the case, no prominence should be given to this phenomenon in defining the tense-form. The change of vowel is the essential characteristic. Pognon still holds to the existence of an Aphel in weak verbs (pp. 144 f.). But the regular absence of the prefix Aleph in Imperative (Haupt, *Fam. Ges.* S. 58, Anm. 8) and Infinitive (Del. in Lotz, *Tig. Pil.* S. 98) make the explanation of the forms as Paël far more satisfactory. The relation between the Egyptian and the Semitic verb-forms (Pognon, pp. 136 ff., 144 ff.) is a field which will be more thoroughly worked by-and-by. The modal distinctions between different forms of the Aorist, etc., to which Sayce and Pognon devote many paragraphs, likewise need much careful study. Neither gives illustrations enough to prove his positions.

In lexicography the labor hitherto done is fragmentary. The lexicon of Norris, faithful, honest work as it was, is the product of a former decade and practically useless, besides being incomplete. Haupt, Lotz and Pognon have all done their share by their thorough etymological discussions, and Lotz's Glossary is full and exceedingly valuable. Hommel's *Namen der Säugethiere bei den Südsemitischen Völkern* (1879) contributes something to the Assyrian. De Chossat's *Répertoire Assyrienne* (1879) is a variegated compilation, scientifically valueless. Stanislas Guyard's *Notes de Lexicographie Assyrienne* (Journ. Asiatique, 1878-80) are, on the contrary, an earnest and scholarly treatment of some 80 or more etymologies. Not all of them commend themselves as correct, the fancy has too free play at times, there is an extreme endeavor to find Semitic roots for Assyrian words, and the judgment is sometimes at fault (e. g. in his Arabic derivation for *avelu* (*amēlu*), "man," which is of non-Semitic origin), but the work is of promising quality.

It is to be hoped that the great lack in this department will soon be supplied by the appearance of Friedrich Delitzsch's *Assyrisches Wörterbuch*, which has been in preparation for some years. It will doubtless be worthy of its author and increase his fame.

FRANCIS BROWN.

---

FRANZÖSISCHE STUDIEN. Herausgegeben von G. KÖRTING und E. KOSCHWITZ.  
I Band. 1 Heft. Heilbronn, Henninger.

Since the time when Raynouard and Diez opened up the domain of Romance speech to scientific inquiry there has been no lack of workers to push forward the same lines of research into the fields untouched by them, for the purpose, on the one hand, of verifying the results already obtained, or, on the other, of solving new problems touching the origin of the neo-Latin idioms. The *Langue d'oïl*, *Langue d'oc* and Low Latin have been studied with a zeal unsurpassed for ardor in the whole circle of philological investigation. In

this struggle to reach the *Ultima Thule* of grammatical history and literary tradition the contemporary languages have been almost totally neglected. How we think in them, how they form an essential part of ourselves, their constant change, their movement, how they form the point of departure for the development of new modes of expression and new word-creations, all these things have been regarded as unnecessary, or, at least, irrelevant in the study of what is fixed, determined and shut in by absolute rule. We are only just waking up to a realization of the fact that the study of contemporaneous speech-formation offers to the philologist as rich a field of inquiry as the past, and it is from this standpoint that we hail with delight the appearance of a new journal specially devoted to the modern forms of the most important member of the Romance languages.

The propagation of Romance philological science is making rapid strides. In 1879 Messrs Körting and Koschwitz established the *Zeitschrift für neu-französische Sprache und Literatur*, which immediately met with such an extensive circulation and called forth such favorable criticism that they were emboldened to make this new venture in special journalism. Its object is to bring before scholars more extensive articles touching subjects of French grammar and literary history than could be given in the *Zeitschrift*, and thus build up with it a sort of *thesaurus* of such materials and productions in French as we have for classical philology in the *Leipziger Studien*, for English in the *Englische Studien*, for German in the *Quellen und Forschungen zur Sprache und Culturgeschichte der germanischen Völker*. While, then, the old French department will not be positively shut out from its pages, it will be, however, chiefly devoted to the modern language, and therefore constitute a sort of supplement to the *Zeitschrift* published by the same editors.

The first number contains 126 pages of closely printed matter, bearing upon two subjects only, viz. *Syntaktische Studien über Voiture* (1598-1648) von W. List, and *Der Versbau bei Philippe Desportes* (1546-1606) und *François de Malherbe* (1555-1628) von P. Groebedinkel.

The writer not having at hand the first four editions of *Voiture* which appeared from 1650-55, has based his investigations in this paper on the two editions of that author published in 1656 and 1660 respectively. The method here pursued is clear and logical, though not so full as might be desired. For example, in treating of the various part of speech, article, pronoun, verb, etc., which are taken up separately, it certainly would have been much more satisfactory could we have had the old French sparingly quoted alongside of the examined text, to bring out sharply the great changes of construction which the language had undergone in this transition-period from the old to the modern model. It is true, the modern rule is stated and the old one referred to before each set of text-extracts, so that the reader is indirectly informed of the fact that the syntax here represented forms a sort of middle term between the free and easy phrasing of the founders of the French language and the stiff, conventional, cast-iron like pattern of to-day; but unless he comes fresh from the perusal of these old writers, he will scarcely appreciate the bold antitheses of construction in these two periods of French literary history by having examples of only one of them laid before him. Thus in the discussion of the pronoun (p. 5) we are told that the accusative neuter is omitted in two cases before the

dative *lui* (et il faut que vous (le) *luy* ayez fait écrire, etc.), and that Vaugelas (*Remarques sur la langue françoise*, Paris, 1647) was the first to condemn this construction, but nothing is suggested as to what was substituted for it. The Old French approved of *il le me dunad*; whence, then, the present *il me le donna*?

In case of the demonstrative, too, we find valuable relics of ancient usage, such as *ce* in intercalated phrases; e. g. *monsieur, ce luy dit Zelide: vous avez l'honneur, ce dit on*. A few interesting examples of periphrasis for the active voice are cited in the remarks on the verb. In old French two means were adopted to express continued action, viz. *estre* with the pres. active part. and *aller* with the gerundium. The former of these disappeared first from the language, but Glauning (*Syntaktische Studien zu Marot*, Nördlingen, 1873) shows that they are both used by Marot (1495-1554), i. e. in the fifteenth century, while with Montaigne (1533-1592) only the *aller* periphrastic form exists. We might, therefore, be tempted to suppose that the *estre*-combination would not occur later than this epoch. Such is not the case, however, and three examples (two with the pres. part., one with the gerundium) are drawn from Voiture, e. g. *ils furent quelques mois jouissans tranquillement de ce plaisir: vous estes-là comme rats en paille . . . tousjours lisant, escrivant*, etc. Thirteen examples are collected (one in prose, twelve in poetry) of the use of *aller* with the gerundium, showing that, at this time, the tendency to form periphrases with this verb was confined more especially to poetic diction. Voiture's employment of tenses did not materially differ from the present usage. Occasionally, however, we find the imperf. ind. where writers of to-day would use the conditional, e. g. *si mon mal se pouvoit guerir . . . cette malice pouvoit estre bonne à quelque chose*. But the most striking deviation from present custom lies in the disposition of his indicative and subjunctive moods. In dependent clauses, for example, after the verbs *assurer*, *avouer*, *penser*, *croire*, *s'imaginer* and *oublier* the subjunctive is used though the principal clause be affirmative, e. g. *Je vous assure, monsieur, qu'il n'y eust eu guerre de raison*, etc.: *je croyois que d'eust esté estre perturbateur du repos public*. Again; relative clauses dependent on a superlative, or on the expressions *le seul*, *le premier*, *le dernier*, have either subj. or indic., e. g. *je fais la meilleure mine que je puis: peut-estre que le seul avantage qu'ils ont sur moi*, etc. In final sentences after verbs expressing an action of the will (*vouloir*, *il faut*, *trouver mauvais*) the division is even, i. e. we have as many indicatives as subjunctives, e. g. *mais je voudrois qu'au lieu qu'il a aymé . . . il se fut adressé*, etc. After the expressions *être bien aise*, *être fâché*, *c'est dommage*, *avoir peur*, and the verbs *s'étonner*, *craindre*, we find both subj. and indic., e. g. *au reste, monseigneur, je suis bien aise que vous avez un commis: je suis fâché que je ne pris garde*, etc. These variations of usage, together with some relating to the change of the pf. part. after *être* and *avoir* (*cette particularité . . . a esté rapporté: les honneurs que j'ay receu*) and to the employment of prepositions after certain verbs and adjectives (*se résoudre de or à, disposer de or à*) constitute a few only of the more important tendencies of Voiture's language. We plainly see from them that the author held to the traditions of the past more closely than would have been expected from a contemporary of Vaugelas and a correspondent of Mlle. de Rambouillet, through whose influence the cause of the reformers, with its watchwords of aristocratic elegance and refinement, had in



great measure triumphed over the brusque, picturesque energy of a language drawn from popular materials. As the oracle of the Hôtel de Rambouillet we should have expected to find him cutting loose from all the old moorings, where he would find himself in any way hampered in his linguistic *tours de force*. He was the *enfant gâté* of his age. Boileau places him alongside of Horace. So much the more valuable, therefore, is this systematic examination of his writings by List. It adds another intermediate link in the chain of studies from the old to the new, and teaches very forcibly the lesson that no set form of human speech can be rapidly supplanted by another, however well supported it may be by the authority of literary excellence.

In the second paper, *Der Versbau, etc.*, the writer begins by referring to the exaggerated appreciation of Malherbe's merits expressed by Boileau in his *Art poétique*, chant I, 130 et seq.

*Enfin Malherbe vint, et, le premier en France,  
Fit sentir dans les vers une juste cadence.*

*Par ce sage écrivain la langue réparée  
N'offrit plus rien de rude à l'oreille épurée.*

Up to the commencement of the present century Malherbe had the unquestioned reputation of being the reformer *par excellence* of French speech and poetry. Since then careful criticism has brought this blind admiration for his services within reasonable bounds, and shown that, though M. must be regarded as a reformer and purifier of his language, much stricter limits must be placed upon his deserts in versification. He pushed to extremes the laws already in force on this subject, and only invented fetters in many cases for poetic art. It was the Romantic school of literature in France which set aside these trammels, and brought into vogue again much of that freedom of verse-form that existed before M.'s time. The object of this article, then, is to show the agreement of M.'s verse-arrangement with that of Desportes, the best living representative of poetic composition when M. came forward with his puristic ideas, to point out what he recognized as good in the then existing verse-system, what he helped to develop, what he called into being that was new and untried, and what were his principal defects. To this end the writer calls in, as a most important aid to his investigation, the edition of Desportes' works issued in 1609, a copy of which exists with critical remarks by Malherbe himself. These bear upon both matter and form; that is, upon the imitation of Italian authors which is found strongly marked in D.'s erotic poems, and upon the constitution of the verse itself. Here we get a clear insight into Malherbe's earnest efforts in this part of his literary career.

The eight syllable and Alexandrine are taken as types for comparison between the two authors, and it is shown that only in the old syntactical *enjambement* can M. lay any claim to originality over his contemporary. Of all the laws of verse which were sanctioned in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, none was more fatal to French poetry than this articulation of verse parts, which, so far as the eight syllable form is concerned, rests upon the same plane of development for both M. and D., while the Alexandrine offers us a much freer treatment with the latter than with the former. In the sixteenth

century, when the influence of Italian literature made itself specially felt in France, and poets discovered in the Latin hexameter what variety and effect could be produced by the overlappings of sense in different verses, the old syntactical dependence was given up and a greater freedom introduced. Ronsard was the pioneer in this innovation, and established a new school of versification which was followed by Desportes; while Malherbe, on the other hand, faithful to his conservative instincts with reference to everything pertaining to form, stuck closely to the teachings of the old-fashioned methods, and endeavored to develop them without injuring the clearness and precision of the verse.

In strophe-building and in syntactical strophe articulation little difference of proceeding is manifest between the two poets, but in rhyme we should naturally expect to find certain differences due to dialect influence, since the one, Malherbe, came from Normandy, while the other, Desportes, came from Chartres. Thus it is that we find rhymes in simple *e ouvert*, which were perfectly correct for Desportes, condemned by Malherbe, because the terminations *eine*, *aine* had for the Norman the same phonetic value, that of an *e ouvert*, followed by a distinct *i*-sound.

In the so-called *rimes riches* Malherbe has for the most part proceeded with more circumspection than his contemporary, and has given them in some cases a purer and completer form. They both stand on the same level with reference to euphony of verse, and while hiatus occasionally comes up in Desportes, it has almost entirely disappeared from Malherbe.

Upon the whole, then, we must consider Malherbe's merciless criticism of Desportes as unjustifiable in view of the fact that they both represent almost universally the same grade of prosodial development, and in the single case (syntactical *enjambement*) where they do materially differ, Malherbe has shown a lack of appreciation for the value of the "new departure" by holding strictly to the old doctrines.

A. M. E.

---

Aucassin und Nicolette, neu nach der Handschrift mit Paradigmen und Glossar, von HERMANN SUCHIER. Zweite Auflage 8, pp. ix, 118. Paderborn: Schöningh. 1881.

Editions of Old French texts which take into account the special needs of the student have been signally wanting. They have either been too long, bulky and uninteresting, or they have not been supplied with those helps, such as a general view of the flexions and a glossary, which are of so much importance in the particular interpretation of them. The editor who has any such object as this in view is met in the very outset with the serious difficulty of properly controlling his manuscript material, which, in a vast majority of cases, is altogether too extensive to be reduced to convenient compass for beginners, and of presenting an adequate survey of the philological and historical questions which abound in most mediæval works. With these drawbacks before them, scholars have generally been content to give us simple texts, adding here and there a striking manuscript variation, but leaving everything else to be found out by the reader as best he can.

Prof. Suchier, in editing the charming story of *Aucassin and Nicolette*, has pursued a course entirely different from most of his predecessors. It is true that his principal object, too, has been to give us as pure a text as possible by collating different editions and making such emendations as seemed obviously necessary from the context, but, alongside of this, he adds a few well considered and appropriate notes, a thorough discussion of the dialect peculiarities of the text, a concise review of grammatical forms, and a most excellent vocabulary, furnished with references for each word to some particular passage in the body of the work where its meaning may be verified. The first edition, thus brought out in 1878, was at once heartily welcomed as a most valuable contribution to the propagation of Romance studies, notwithstanding certain disadvantages which the work, as such, offered, viz: a rather too limited text (42 octavo pages in all); its not being a specimen of a special kind, in other words, that it stands there as something peculiar in Old French literature; that the matter narrated is foreign, non-French; that, in fine, it does not constitute a well rounded, complete whole. But in spite of these adverse circumstances, the editor, with his usual close observation, acuteness of discernment, sharp-sighted judgment, and rigid, scientific method, has given us in this second edition (1881) the only model *work-book* which has ever been published in this field. It is worthy of, and will doubtless find, a wide circulation.

*Aucassin et Nicolette* is an idyllic song-story, i. e. a peculiar mixture of a story in prose and of a song in verse, known under the technical name *chante-fable*, the story, however, being kept strictly in the prose. The scene is laid in the beautiful valleys of Provence, and our editor thinks that its author, though a native of the north, was personally acquainted with the extraordinary natural charms of this "south country," and hence laid the plot of his work there. The date of composition is set down for the beginning of the thirteenth century.

The text was copied by Suchier from the only existing manuscript, sent to him in Halle from the National Library of Paris. His corrections have, for the most part, greatly improved the original, though occasionally readings are kept, as suggested by previous editors, the propriety of which may be strongly questioned. Some of these, however, have been discarded entirely, or happily corrected in the second edition, e. g. IV, 11, I Ed. *ce poise moi qu'il iva ne qu'il i vient a ce qu'il i parole*: II Ed. *ne qu'il i vient ne qu'il i parole*: XX, 14, I Ed. *Qui que derve, n'ost joie Aucassins ne n'ot talent*: II Ed. *Qui que demenast joie, Aucassins n'en ot talent*.

A good example of Suchier's prudent emendation, and better reading as compared with other editions, may be found in XXIV, 1, *Aucassins ala par le forest de voie en voie* (S.): *Aucassins ala par le forest devers Nicolette*, which is a conjecture of Méon, followed by Gaston Paris.

The notes are not numerous (6 pages), but what they give is of positive worth. They aim more at an explanation of the real difficulties in the text than at supplementing it with extraneous matter.

In the vocabulary we have noted the following important changes in definition and additions of meanings, which were either not given at all in the first edition or were incorrect.

VI, 30.—*Estrumel*, mit blossen Beinen (trumel), zerlumpt (I Ed.): mit Geschwüren (*estrume*, Aeneas S. 12, *lat.* struma) bedeckt (II Ed.)

XIV, 20.—*Cateron*, Kätzchen, Brustwarze (I Ed.): Köpfchen; Brustwarze (II Ed.)

XIV, 27.—*Gaite*, masc. Wächter (I Ed.): fem. (II Ed.)<sup>1</sup>

XV, 13.—*Souduiant*, Soldat (I Ed.): Verräther (II Ed.) Bida has likewise confounded the words *soudoier* (soldier) and *souduiant* present participle of *souduire* (to betray). Bartsch, too, has mistaken the signification of this word, cf. *Chrestomathie de l'ancien Français* 284, 12; et 714.

XXVI, 22.—*Plain*, eben, has been added, and indeed was the only word wanting to render the vocabulary of the first edition complete.

About the time Suchier's first edition of *Aucassin und Nicolette* appeared at Paderborn, another of an entirely different character came to light in Paris under the title, *Aucassin et Nicolette, chantefable du douzième siècle traduite par A. Bida, révision du texte original et préface par G. Paris*.

This work is not scientific, but has a purely literary worth, and is intended for the general public. The celebrated French artist, Alexandre Bida, furnished designs for the illustrations. The admirable translation into modern French is followed by the original text reviewed from the MS., and both preceded by an interesting historical preface, designed to prepare the reader for a better appreciation of the composition before him. An Eng. translation of this Bida-text was brought out in New York, as a holiday-book for Christmas 1880, under the title, *The Lovers of Provence*, to which the poet Stedman contributed an introductory note and poem. There is no work in the whole range of old French literature which illustrates better than this one the delicate, romantic sentiment of the *Trouvères*, or the fresh spirit of the poetry of this period.

A. M. E.

A Study of Plutarch's Life of Artaxerxes. Doct. Diss. by CHARLES FORSTER SMITH. Leipzig, 1881.

The greater part of this essay is taken up with an attempt to indicate the sources from which Plutarch drew his information in writing the life of Artaxerxes. This question has already engaged the attention of other scholars, whose views are referred to, as occasion requires, by Mr. Smith. The conclusion at which he arrives is that Plutarch's main authority for the life as a whole was the *Περσικά* of Dinon, though for one portion, cc. 11-19, he is chiefly indebted to Ctesias. The close scrutiny with which the minutest indications have been examined, and the ingenuity with which the results thus deduced have been combined, is deserving of all praise. It would be impertinent in one who has not devoted any special study to the question to express a positive opinion that Mr. Smith has not made out his case, particularly as he himself says that "after all it must be confessed that the question is largely one of probabilities." But the present writer may be permitted to say that a careful reading of the life produces on his mind the impression that Plutarch had, before he sat down to

<sup>1</sup> Prof. Tobler appropriately remarks with reference to the word *gens*, also, which modern French grammarians set down as sometimes masculine, sometimes feminine, that it is *always* feminine, but that attributives connected with it *ad sensum* are brought into agreement with it.

write it, endeavored to make himself master of the facts by reading his various authorities, and then constructed it out of the materials thus fresh in his remembrance, and that he only referred on occasion to this or that authority when he recollected that there was a greater or less divergence among them. One statement of the writer that what Plutarch has from Xenophon "in the Artaxerxes was taken principally at second hand through some other source," seems very improbable. The fact that passages in which the very words of the *Anabasis* are quoted contain additional statements which Xenophon does not make, is surely inadequate to support the view that Plutarch had not Xenophon's work in his hands while he was compiling his material; particularly as Plutarch speaks in the highest terms of Xenophon as a narrator: c. 8, *Ξενοφώντος μονονουχὶ δεικνύοντος ὅφει καὶ τοῖς πράγμασιν ὥς οὐ γεγενημένοις ἀλλὰ γινόμενοις ἐφιστάντος ἀεὶ τὸν ἄκροατὴν ἐμπαθῇ καὶ συγκινδυνεύοντα διὰ τὴν ἐνάργειαν*.

The latter part of the treatise is devoted to the various accounts given of the battle of Kunaxa, the result of which is that the narrative of Xenophon is shown to be the most intelligible and consistent.

The tone of the whole essay leaves nothing to be desired; and though Mr. Smith has in this little treatise made an attempt to construct a theory on a very slender basis, he would no doubt subscribe to the dictum of a French writer who says: "la critique conjecturale a du bon, mais à la condition qu'elle ne se surfasse pas elle-même et qu'elle ne prétende point à la certitude."

C. D. MORRIS.

De arte metrica Commodiani. . . . Scripsit FRIDERICUS HANSSSEN (Doct. Diss.) Argentorati, 1881.

This volume of ninety pages contains an elaborate attempt to reduce to order the chaos of the miserable hexameters of Commodianus; but after reading the work, one is still constrained to believe with Lucian Müller, that the verses were written "contemptu fere regularum." As to the laws of quantity, the conclusion of Hanssen is that they are observed only in the thesis of the second foot, and in the thesis of the fifth with the arsis of the sixth; but that even here the laws are totally different from those of classic Latin poets, and are not consistently applied! I cite as a sample one verse restored by Hanssen:

Súscitantúrque solóíimmortáles fácti de móрте.

M. W. H.

Ueber den Einfluss des Reimes auf die Sprache Otfrid's besonders in Bezug auf Laut- und Formenlehre, von THEODORE INGENBLEEK. Mit einem Reimlexicon zu Otfrid. Karl J. Trübner, Strassburg, 1880.

Such is the title of a welcome little essay on the influence of rhyme upon Otfrid's language, a subject on which we have as yet only scattered remarks, found in the various commentaries and grammatical works on Otfrid's *Evangelienbuch*. It contains, as the title indicates, a rhyme-index and a list of the places cited, thus making it a convenient little book of reference to Otfrid. The purpose of the author has been rather to collect and arrange under



appropriate headings the cases where influence of rhyme has been at work, than to institute an investigation of the forms employed. This of course led to a division of the subject entirely according to outward signs, if I may be allowed the expression, and not according to inherent principles, which a purely scientific treatment of the subject would have demanded. It is much to be regretted that the author had not enlarged his plan to a discussion of the origin and value of the peculiar forms thus employed by this early and great poet, and to a comparison of them with similar forms in the sister dialects, inasmuch as the results of the investigation would then have been of more general interest, and in all probability many problems would have thus been solved, as many of the peculiar forms of the declension discussed in this essay have their exact counterparts in other sister dialects. This is a work that must still be done, and could have been done here with but little more outlay of time and research. Yet we will be thankful for the good we have received in this essay. It gives faithfully Otfrid's peculiarities, and explains as many of them as the plan of the work admitted. And with this plan the division made is the best one possible, as it takes up in regular order the Verb, the Substantive and Adjective, the Adverb, the Participle, and lastly Syntax.

Let us take up some of these points in the order in which they occur. On p. 10 under Assimilation of two consonants we find *uuesstn* : *missn* II, 5, 18 where *missn* stands for *mistn*, the common form of the past subjunctive. Kögel Germanische Dentalverbindung in P. B. VII 171-201 has formulated the law for the assimilation of a following to a preceding *s*. 1. The second *s* must necessarily be one of the accented suffixes *-td-*, *-tt-*, *-tū-*. All words with *ss* were therefore oxytones in Teutonic. 2. The first *s* cannot have come from the original spirant *s*. 3. *ss* was always intervocalic in Teutonic, and here it must be remembered that *j* and *w* are vowels after a preceding long syllable, p. 173. Kögel farther explains the German *missen*, O. E. *missan*, O. N. *missa*, Teutonic *miss-ja-n* as formed from the part. *miss*, which, according to him, stands for "*mit-tt-s* and is the regular participle to *mīdan* (the Gothic would be *meipān*)=Lat. *mittere* (in inscriptions *mittere*), now written *mittere*. The oldest meaning of this verb is '*fahren lassen*.' Thus we have *mīdan* : *missen* : *mittere* : *amittere*." But with a present *missjan* *missan* we should expect in the past tense of the O. H. G. *mistn* and not our form *missn*, and we find the first to be the regular form of the past tense. Accordingly we must either accept with Ingelbleek an irregular assimilation of *t* to the preceding *s* on account of the rhyme, or explain this uncommon form otherwise. The other forms which this word shows and not in rhyme lead us, however, to another explanation, which we shall find by accepting with Hermann Möller a *t*-praeteritum (*Kunpa* und das *T*-praeteritum in P. B. VII 457-481), who objects to Kögel's explanation of Gothic, O. N. *vissa*, O. E. *wisse*, O. H. G., O. S. *wessa* as an analogous formation (to similar forms in other words) formed from the old participle *viss*, which according to Möller is "really an adjective and not a participle, cf. German *gewiss*." Möller explains this form as a *t*-praeteritum from *vid* to see: thus *vitām* *vitāt* became according to Kögel's law regularly *vissa*. In the same way from the stem *mīd* (*carere*) we should have the praeteritum *mittām* *mittāt* from which the later *missa* would be the regular reflexion, and which the more common form *mista* from *missan* was gradually at this period superseding and

did finally entirely supersede. Thus Otfred made use of the one or the other form according to the needs of his verse.

p. 11. For the explanation of the *s* in *konsti* the collateral form to *konda* cf. Hermann Möller in P. B. VII 464 ff.

p. 12. For *firsurni* cf. Kluge in Q. F. 32, 145.

p. 13. For *sasta* cf. Hermann Möller cl. 479.

On the same page § 7 the subject of a change of gender or stem is treated, though only in so far as the metre has influenced the poet in the choice of one of two forms both of which have equal authority, or even sometimes to employ forms or a gender not found elsewhere. The author has not attempted an investigation into the cause of such change of an *a-* to an *i-* stem or *vice versa*, as this lay outside of the plan adopted by him. And yet this would have been a thankful investigation, though undoubtedly a somewhat extended one. It is in fact a question the solution of which would probably throw much light upon the complicated subject of anomalies and mixed forms in the declension. A glance at the O. H. G. substantives will suffice to show a frequent change between the *a-* (*ā-* *n-*) and *i-* stems, as in *finger*, d. pl. *fingeron*, *fingerin*, *nagel*, pl. *nagala*, *negeli*, *spanga*, pl. *spangi*, *stanga*, d. pl. *stangen*, ac. pl. *stanga*, *stangi*, *zanga*, pl. *zangi*, and many others. Some of these stems are stems which show consonant forms in Old Norse, and undoubtedly the fundamental cause is the same. It probably indicates a divergency in the development of one and the same, or a confounding of two distinct declensions, in the first case caused by difference in the place of the primary accent, in the second by the fact that some of the cases of the two different declensions became similar, which led to the confounding of the two declensions. Here we cannot enter more fully into a discussion of this very interesting subject, reserving what we have farther to say for some future occasion.

p. 21, § 10. I, 3, 37 *iro dāgo uuard giuudgo fon altōn uulzāgōn* "scheint nur eine lizenz für das fem. *giuuaga*." Müllenhoff und Scherer Denk.<sup>3</sup> 436.

p. 22. *Maht* erscheint stets ohne umlaut, nur II, 17, 22 heisst es *mehti* (*krefti*). For the non-umlaut of *maht* cf. Braune Zur Althochdeutschen Lautlehre in P. B. IV, 541.

p. 23. *Magad* is as the author states on old *i-* stem, and the d. pl. *uueroltmagadon* is probably to be explained by the dropping of the *i* after dentals (cf. On the Consonant Declension in Old Norse, above), and then transition into the *a-* declension.

p. 24. In the d. sg. *akus* instead of *akusi* we have another instance of the dropping of the light vowel after *s* as discussed above p. 200 ff.

p. 26. The author is right in considering *duro* g. pl. for *turio*, and might also have cited the O. N. *dyrr* (pl.) in addition to the O. E. *duru* as proof of a *u-* stem (i. e. in O. H. G. an *i-* stem into which declension all the *u-* stems have passed in O. H. G.); farther O. S. ac. pl. *duri*=*januas*, Ps. 73, 6.

p. 29. n. pl. *fatera* after the *a-* declension is not merely a peculiarity of the O. H. G., but shows itself also in the other dialects, and especially in the plural of this word. O. Frise also has *fetera*, O. E. *fāteras*. It would repay the trouble of tracing the transition of these old consonant stems into the vowel declension throughout all the dialects, a research which would no doubt throw more light upon the question of the gradual disappearance of the consonant

stems. Most of the other *Tar-* stems have either passed as a general rule into the *u-* declension (cf. O. N. pl., O. E. and some forms of the O. Frise and O. H. G.) or remained intact in their old consonant declension (as for instance O. S., O. H. G. and O. Frise, the occasional *i-* forms excepted).

This word furnishes a good example of what I touched upon in my opening remarks, viz., the failure to take up and discuss the forms themselves in their philological relations to the whole Teutonic group. The mere fact that Otfrid used a form not in common use is interesting in itself, but receives an additional interest as soon as we learn that it is an historical form fast disappearing from the language, a relic of a conjugation or declension which is fast becoming obsolete, a landmark thus almost accidentally preserved, which greatly helps us in tracing the growth of the language. Otfrid probably invented no new forms for the occasion, but only employed uncommon ones taken from the unwritten or at least to us unpreserved language.

Though this failure to grasp the subject in its broadest sense detracts materially from the work, it does not by any means signify that it has been done in vain. It lays the foundation for farther investigation and is an invaluable aid in the study of Otfrid.

S. P.

## REPORTS.

MNEMOSYNE, Vol. VIII, pt. 3.

This number opens with thirteen pages of notes by Cobet on Galen, *περὶ διαγνώσεως καὶ θεραπείας τῶν ἐν τῇ ἐκάστον ψυχῇ ἰδίων παθῶν*. He quotes a long passage in which Galen deplores the little sympathy he got even from his friends in his pursuit of science, while they assured him that if he did not pay the usual court to the rich and great he could be of no use to himself or to them. But he remarks, of the physicians of old time οὐδεὶς οὔτε ἔωθεν ἐπὶ τὰς τῶν πλουσίων ἐφοῖτα θήρας προσαγορεύσων αὐτοὺς οὐτ' εἰς ἐσπέραν δειπνησόμενος; and contrasts them with Thessalus, who οὐ τὰ ἄλλα μόνον ἐκολάκευε τοὺς ἐπὶ τῆς Ῥώμης πλουσίους ἀλλὰ καὶ τῷ μῆσιν ἐξ ἐπαγγελίαςθαι διδάξειν τὴν τέχνην. No wonder, says Cobet, when σκντοτόμοι καὶ τέκτονες καὶ βαφεῖς καὶ χαλκεῖς ἐπιτηδῶσιν ἤδη τοῖς ἔργοις τῆς ἱατρικῆς τὰς ἀρχαίας αὐτῶν ἀπολιπόντες τέχνας, that doctors of this sort "ab aegrotantium cognatis male mulcari;" and he quotes passages in which Galen says that the physicians were glad to escape with their lives, ὡχρότεροι καὶ ψυχρότεροι τοῦ νοσοῦντος αὐτοῦ γενόμενοι.

He shows that some of the sentiments found in this book are from the *χρονᾶ ἐπη*, attributed to Pythagoras, of which Galen says of himself, καὶ ταύτας δὴ τὰς φερομένας ὡς Πυθαγόρου παραινέσεις εἴθισα [leg. εἰθισμαι] δις τῆς ἡμέρας ἀναγιγνώσκων μὲν τὰ πρῶτα λέγειν δὲ ἀπὸ στόματος ὑστερον.

The text of Galen (in the edition of Kühn, Lipsiae, 1823) is very corrupt; and Cobet's emendations are in nearly every case happy and convincing. But they do not lend themselves to quotation. A single specimen may be given. "Pag. 32, καὶ διὰ τοῦτο ΤΑΙΣ μὲν οἰνόφλυΓΑΙΣ ἔστιν ἰδεῖν ἡδομένους ὅταν πίνοντες ὑπερβάλλωνται τοὺς συμπτώτας. Sublato duplici mendo scribendum: ΤΟΥΣ μὲν οἰνόφλυΓΑΣ ἔστιν ἰδεῖν ἡδομένους ὅταν—ὑπερβάδωνται. Οἰνόφλυξ pro *temulento* et apud alios saepe legitur et frequens est apud Hippocratem, unde Galenus sumsit."

The next article is by S. A. Naber (pp. 246–268), who continues his notes on the Comic Fragments. A specimen or two of his corrections may be given.

In a fragment of the *Nauagós* of Ephippus which is in other respects corrupt occurs the line—

τῶν ἐξ Ἀκαδημείας τις ὑπὸ Πλάτωνα καί—

Since ὑπὸ Πλάτωνα is unintelligible and καί seems to have no place, he conjectures αὐτοπλάτων δοκῶν, after the pattern of αὐτοβορέας, αὐτοθαῖς, αὐτομέλιννα, as Cobet (V. L. p. 285) has written in Plat. Menex. 245 d, αὐτοέλληνες for αὐτοὶ Ἕλληνες. In the same way in Plat. Polit. 269 e, he proposes to write ὅτι συμκροτάτην τῆς αὐτοκινήσεως παράλλαξιν (for αὐτοῦ κινήσεως): in Plat. Legg. 817 b, ἡμεῖς ἔσμεν τραγῳδίας αὐτοποιηταί (for αὐτοὶ ποιηταί): and in Thuc. VII, 57, 2 Ἀθηναῖοι μὲναὐτοίωνες ἐπὶ Δωριᾶς Συρακοσίους ἐκόντες ἦλθον (for αὐτοὶ Ἴωνες).

A fragment of the *Θράσων* of Alexis runs thus in the MSS. of Athenaeus:

σοῦ δ' ἐγὼ λαλιστέραν  
οὐπόποτ' εἶδον οὔτε κερκώπην, γύναι,  
οὐ κίτταν, οὐκ ἀηδόν', οὐ τρυγόν', οὐ τέττιγα.

Meineke edited after Porson *οὔτε τρυγόν' οὐ | τέττιγα*. Cobet objected to this emendation (1) because of *οὔτε* introduced between the repeated *οὐ's*, and (2) because in such an enumeration of chatters the swallow could not have been omitted, and proposed to read *οὐ χελιδόνα, | οὐ τρυγόν', οὐ τέττιγα*. Naber shows that Elmsley has quoted several examples of such an irregular combination of negatives, though he thinks it should not be introduced by conjecture; and objects further to Cobet's correction, that though the mention of the swallow may have been necessary, that of the nightingale is by no means to be expected, of which "non est molesta loquacitas." This too Meineke had thought of; and had therefore proposed *οὐ χελιδόν' οὔτε τρυγόνά*. Naber thinks that "unius animalculi nomen excidisse" . . . and proposes *οὐ κίτταν, οὐ χελιδόν', οὐ τιτιγόνοιον, οὐ τρυγόν', οὐ τέττιγα*. "Scribit Athenaeus IV, p. 133 B, ἔστι δ' ἡ κερκώπη ζῷον ὅμοιον τέττιγι καὶ τιτιγονίῳ, deinde pergit et laudat etiam hunc ipsum Alexidis locum, quem emendare conati sumus."

Naber persists in the inconvenient practice of referring to the fragments on which he comments by the pages of the authors by whom they are quoted, and only seldom by the pages of Meineke, or by the name of the play. This causes considerable labor if one wishes to judge of the plausibility of a conjecture by considering the context of the emended passage. For example: this line is found in the midst of a long fragment of the *Κρατεύας* ἡ *Φαρμακοπώλης*:

τούτοις μάγειρος οὐ πρόσεισ', οὐκ ὀψεται.

"Emenda: οἷδ' ὀψεται, quod certum mihi esse videtur. Similem corruptelam odoror in Euripidis *Ione* vs. 1037, ubi Creusae verba sunt, venenum paedagogo tradentis quo filium interimat.

κἄνπερ διέλθῃ λαμόν, οὐποθ' ἴζεται  
κλεινῆς 'Αθήνας, κατθανὼν δ' αὐτοῦ μενεῖ,

ubi multo malim legere: *οὐποθ' ὀψεται*. Huiusmodi coniecturae se ipsas commendare debent aut frustra commendabuntur."

Occasionally he proposes as new a correction already made. For example: in a fragment of the *Μελισσία*, which contains some remarks of a cook on the necessity of prompt attendance on the part of the guests if his science is to produce its perfect work, it is pointed out that Meineke gives one line to the cook which necessarily belongs to the person he is talking to. But this is already indicated in Bothe's edition.

The next article is by Cobet, on certain passages in Antiphon (pp. 269-291): with special reference to an edition of the orations and remarks on them by Victor Jernstedt, of St. Petersburg. Cobet bestows high commendation on this work, but finds still something left for himself to do. On the necessity of indicating elision and crasis in certain combinations he says: "vel sola auris admonet vitiosa esse *εὐ οἶδα ὅτι, οὐκ οἶδα ὅπως, παρὰ 'Αθηναίους, ὀλίγα ἅττα, πολλὰ*



ἄττα et similia his sexcenta. Optime hoc senties si verba oratorum alta voce legere, aut etiam, quasi ipse diceret, agere consueveris, id quod discipulis meis sedulo inculcare et exemplo praeire soleo. In hoc tam rapido verborum flumine molestae vocales veluti sua sponte excidunt, quod nisi fiat hiulca oratio inepte te relinquit hiantem."

In Antiph. I, 12, he restores καταψηφιεῖσθε after ὅπως μή (for καταψηφίσσῃ) and takes occasion to refer to the conclusion of Herwerden (*Lapidum de dialecto Attica testimonia*, p. 74), who finds in an inscription ἐπιμελεῖσθαι τοὺς στρατηγοὺς —ὅπως—(κομί) Σωνται "ex quo loco simul manifesto apparet vanam esse quorundam opinionem—ὅπως non admittere coniunctivum aoristi primi activi et medii." This Cobet states is the single instance in all the Attic inscriptions: and then he shows that in the previous part of the same inscription we have ἐπιμελεῖσθαι ὅπως ἂν προσόδου τοῦ γὰρ ἐλπί—then the clause referred to by Herwerden. As ὅπως ἂν is frequent in the inscriptions after ἐπιμελεῖσθαι, and we have it twice in this one: so we should certainly read ὅπως ἂν—κομίσωνται. While admitting the great value of the inscriptions, Cobet insists that here too the μηδὲν ἄγαν must be kept in view, and that we must remember that the γραμματεῖς who drew up decrees were not men of learning, but often ἀπαίδευτοὶ τινες καὶ ἀμαθεῖς, and that therefore 'non est mirandum monumenta quaedam etiam perantiqua vitiis scatere, quibus accedunt errores novi, quos lapididarum incuria fudit': and to illustrate this he quotes from one (I, 168, p. 77) ΘΗΙ βουλεῖ, τει βουλει, κιτιεῖς, κιτιέων, κιτιέων, ἰδρύσσει, ξυμβάλλεσθαι, Λυκοργος, ἐκποροι, ἐκπόροι, ἐκκτησιν.

Of the Tetralogies he says: "quae sequuntur Tetralogiae plenae pravi et vitiosi acuminis non sunt ad meum palatum. Itaque

ἄλλοις τὰ κομψὰ ταῦτ' ἀφείξ σοφίσματα

transeo ad orationem περὶ τοῦ Ἡρώδου φόνου."

A single specimen of his notes here may be given. In § 59 we have: σὺ δὲ με ἐν ἀφανεῖ λόγῳ ζητεῖς ἀπολέσαι. What, he asks, is the meaning of this? Bekker refers us to a note of Hemsterhuys on Lucian: "sed nihil hinc proficimus: Hemsterhusius enim imbibet errorum hunc, bene Graece dici pro *fuste virga percutere aliquem* καθικέσθαι τινός 'EN βακτηρία, 'EN βάβδω, et ex decrepita Graecia putidissimos testes Manethonem, Quintum Calabrum et similes produxit, quibuscum componit Antiphontem, qui dixerit 'EN ἀφανεῖ λόγῳ pro ἀφανεῖ λόγῳ. Quis haec hodie probabit? Nemo hercle: itaque alio modo laboranti Antiphonti opitulandum. In tempore succurrit Antiphontis discipulus Thucydides VI, 54: βίαιον μὲν οὐδὲν ἐβούλετο δρᾶν, ἐν τρόπῳ δὲ τινι ἀφανεῖ παρεσκευάζετο προπηλακίων αὐτόν, nam sic legendum pro τόπῳ, ut I, 97, ἐν οἷῳ τρόπῳ κατέστη."

On § 50 of Orat. VI (περὶ τοῦ χορευτοῦ) he changes μεσηγγησάμενοι into μεσηγγυσάμενοι. The former "pugnat cum analogia: nempe ex ἐγγή recte ἐγγῶν, ἐξεγγῶν, ἐγγῶσθαι, formantur, et perpetuo omnium usu frequentantur. Ex μεσέγγνος autem non μεσεγγῶσθαι nascitur, sed μεσεγγνοῦσθαι, non μεσεγγήμα sed μεσεγγῶμα." And he shows that in all cases where the word occurs in Isocrates, Plato, and Demosthenes, the best MSS. give the correct form.

The next article (pp. 292-306) contains notes on Thucyd. VII by Van Herwerden. These remarks are largely occupied with the ejection of 'frigida emblemata.' For example: on c. 18, 2: τοὺς Ἀθηναίους ἐνόμιζον διπλοῦν τὸν πόλεμον ἔχοντας [πρὸς τε σφᾶς καὶ Σικελιώτας] εὐκαθαιρετωτέρους εἶσθαι. "Perstolidus sit necesse est qui quod duplex bellum intelligendum sit punctum temporis dubitare possit. Felicius evasit locus cap. 28, 3 μάλιστα δ' αὐτοὺς ἐπέλεξεν ὅτι δύο πολέμους ἅμα εἶχον, ubi tamen Scholiasta aequalibus suis utile existimavit annotare τὸν τε Πελοποννησιακὸν καὶ τὸν Σικελικόν."

On c. 25, 1, in commenting on the use of ὅπως with the fut. or 1 aor. subj., he refers to the authority of the inscription, which has been already mentioned in Cobet's notes on Antiphon (see p. 243); and says that his rule in editing Thuc. is: to give the 1st aorist when all the MSS. agree in presenting it: the future, when there is any variation in the testimony.

On c. 69, 4 εὐθὺς ἐπλεον πρὸς τὸ ζεύγμα τοῦ λιμένος [καὶ τὸν καταλειφθέντα διέκπλουν] βουλόμενοι βιάσασθαι ἐς τὸ ἔξω, after noting that the MSS. and editors differ as to the participle, and rejecting the pertinence of Classen's reference to Hdt. VII, 36 (of Xerxes' bridge) διέκπλουν ὑπόφανσιν κατέλιπον τῶν πεντηκοντέρων καὶ τριηρέων τριχοῦ, he expresses his agreement with Boehme that it is absurd to suppose that the Syracusans had left any opening in their inclosing barrier. This he thinks is proved by § 2, where it is said of the Athenians that after making their way to τὸ ζεύγμα and getting the better of the ships stationed near it ἐπειρώντο λύειν τὰς κλήσεις 'quo sane nihil opus fuisset εἰ περιλειφθῇ διέκπλους. Nihil igitur relinquitur quam ut verba inclusa ut emblemata expungamus.' There is surely no difficulty in supposing with Grote (VII, p. 447) that 'a narrow opening, perhaps closed by a movable chain, had been left for merchant vessels'; and then Classen's quotation is quite in point.

In the next article (pp. 307-324) H. W. Van der Mey prints vv. 529-1055 of the *Codex Mutinensis* of Theognis, and makes some remarks on certain passages as exhibited in the recent editions of J. Sitzler and Ch. Ziegler.

J. H. A. Michelsen derives from his reading of the *Codex Sinaiticus* four emendations: in Acts iv. 7, ἐν ποίῳ ὀνόματι πονεῖτε (for ἐποιήσατε τοῦτο): in Acts xxvi. 21 εὐλαβούμενοι (for συλλαβόμενοι): in Acts xxvii. 7 μὴ προσέχειν ἔωτος ἡμᾶς τοῦ ἀνέμου (for προσεῶντος): in 1 Cor. viii. 3 γινώσεται (for ἐγνωσται ὑπ' αὐτοῦ.)

The last article (pp. 329-344) contains a review by Cobet of the recent edition of Plato's Protagoras, by M. Schanz. It is largely occupied with the detection of 'supervacua et molesta verba' and of passages where 'quod Plato scite et exquisite dixerat insulsum emblemata corrumpit.' As a specimen of a change of a different sort we may take p. 314 b: ἴωμεν καὶ ἀκούσωμεν τοῦ ἀνδρός, ἔπειτα ἀκούσαντες καὶ ἄλλους ἀνακοινώσωμεθα. Here he proposes to write ἀκουσόμενοι for καὶ ἀκούσωμεν, on the ground that 'dicendi consuetudo Graecorum in tali re postulat' the future participle. Of this he quotes instances from other authors as well as from the Protagoras itself. But because the participle is often used, it does not seem to follow that the simple parataxis of the received reading should be considered objectionable.

On p. 334 a: τὰ δὲ βουσὶν μόνον (ὠφέλιμα) τὰ δὲ κύνιν τὰ δὲ γε τοῦτων μὲν οὐδέ τι δένδροις δέ: he remarks: 'quam vellem editor vulgatam οὐδέ τι intactam reliquis-

sel. οὐδένας de hominibus tantum dicitur, οὐδένας τῶν Ἑλλήνων, nulla Graeciae civitas. Neutrum οὐδένα non est Graecum. Rectissime autem de bubus, canibus, equis dicitur τούτων οὐδέν.

On p. 359 e: ἐσκοτώθη τε καὶ Εἰλιγγίασα: 'editor futilissimis grammaticis credidit ἱλιγγος scribendum esse, sed Εἰλιγγιᾶν, idque ex scripturis codicum nostrorum asserere conatur, in quibus quum μυριάκις scribatur EI pro I longo et non minus saepe I pro EI, non est his testimonii dictio. Ut de forma ἱλιγγος constat, sic ubique Ἱλιγγιᾶν et Ἱλιγγίασα restituendum. Consuetudo veterum librariorum fert ut scribatur τειμή, τειμᾶν, ἄτειμος, ἐπίτειμος, sim. Vera lectio est τιμή, τιμᾶν, ἄτιμος, ἐπίτιμος. Quid diceres si quis vellet τιμή scribere et τειμᾶν?

Besides his formal articles, Cobet fills several unoccupied parts of pages with sundry notes on Galen.

#### Part IV.

The whole of this number, with the exception of a new series of ἀτακτα from Dr. Badham (pp. 401-406) and a continuation of notes on the comic fragments by S. A. Naber (pp. 407-435) is furnished by Cobet.

The first article (pp. 345-390) is entitled 'Ἀπομνημονεύματα Guilielmi Georgii Pluygers.' We are told of Pluygers that 'iniquo animo ferebat laudationes et encomia et elogia, quibus defuncti, quorum quidem sit nomen aliquod et fama, celebrari solent, et litteris post suam mortem aperiendis obsecravit amicos nequid huiusmodi sibi facerent.' But his work was incessant and distinguished by the most scrupulous exactness. 'Nihil ex manibus suis exire patiebatur quod non esset omnibus modis limatum et expoliturum numquam sibi ipsi satisfaciens nedum placens.' As he left a large number of marginal annotations and κατορθώματα particularly on the Latin authors, Cobet thinks that it will be no violation of the dying request of his friend, 'ex pluribus ab eo repertis potiora quaedam simplicibus verbis cum philologis communicare.' He begins therefore with annotations on Halm's edition of Cornelius Nepos. Two or three specimens of these notes may be quoted. 'Chabr. III, 3, est enim hoc commune vitium magnis liberisque civitatibus ut—libenter de iis detrahant quos eminere videant altius neque animo aequo pauperes alienam opulentiam intueantur fortunam. Optime correxit:—alienam opulentiam intueantur expuncto fortunam. Factum est quod assolet: postquam opulentiam scribae incuria in opulentiam conversum est, non defuit qui de suo, id est de nihilo, fortunam adderet.' 'Datam. VI, 5, hac re probata exercitum educit, Mithrobarzanem persequitur tantum: qui cum ad hostes pervenerat, Datames signa inferri iussit. Loco pessime mulcato ita succurrit ut scriberet: Mithrobarzanem persequitur, qui tantum quod ad hostes pervenerat cum Datames signa inferri iussit.' 'Epam. VII, 1, Cum eum propter invidiam cives sui praeficere exercitui noluisse duxque esset delectus belli imperitus, cuius errore eo esset deducta [illa multitudo militum] ut omnes de salute pertimescerent. Acute vidit legendum esse cuius errore RES eo esset deducta, qua lectione recepta verba a sciolo interpolata: illa multitudo militum ultro excidunt.'

Then follow notes of a similar character on the Rhetorical writings and the Orations of Cicero. A single specimen may be given. Pro Cluent. § 50, 'accusabat autem ille quidem Scamandrum verbis tribus [venenum esse deprehen-

sum]: *omnia tela totius accusationis in Oppianicum coniciebantur*. Lucem ac salutem huic loco Pluygers attulit qui primus vidit quo sensu *verbis tribus* esset accipiendum. Adscripsit enim Plauti locum in *Milite Glorioso* vs. 1019

A. *cedo te mihi solae solum.*

B. *brevin an longinquo sermoni?* A. *tribus verbis.*

Cicero dixerat accusatorem in Scamandrum pauca negligenter dixisse et omnia accusationis tela in Oppianicum coniecisse. Supervenit magistellus qui credebat *verbis tribus* proprie esse accipiendum et tria verba quae essent quaerere coepit. Non poterat supplere DO, DICO, ADDICO, sed tandem de suo finxit *verbis tribus* VENENUM ESSE DEPREHENSUM. I nunc atque haec interpretare.

In the next article Cobet continues his remarks on Schanz's edition of Plato's Protagoras. As he does not find much else to say, he takes occasion from the occurrence of *συνδιασκοποῖν* in p. 361 d, to state once more that in such contracted verbs the forms in *οῖν* etc. are the only correct ones in Attic prose. They have maintained themselves with great regularity in the 1st person, but in the 2d and 3d 'passim comparent formae vitiosae et veteribus inauditae *δοκοῖς, δοκοῖ, ζητοῖς, ζητοῖ, διοκοῖς, διοκοῖ*, similesque sexcentae quae nullius dialecti sunt et τοῦ πονηροῦ κόμματος. Iones enim constanter dicebant *νοσέοιμι*, Athenienses *νοσοῖν*, Tragici forma ex duabus dialectis mixta *νοσοῖμι*.' How does it come to pass then that these incorrect forms appear so constantly in the writings of Plato? 'Nempe LECTIONES CODICUM PENDENT AB OPINIONIBUS GRAMMATICORUM, qui quum olim docti et acuti fuissent, in decrepita Graecia supra quam credi potest indocti, imperiti, leves et futiles in communi omnium senio facti sunt.' Some illustrations of this are given from the MSS. of Cornelius Nepos, and occasion is taken to protest against the insertion into the text of writers of the Ciceronian age of archaic forms in deference to the authority of any MS. 'Sed Catulli urbanorum omnium lepidissimi vicem doleo, qui nunc Criticorum vitio squalidae antiquitatis sordibus obsitus circum-ambulat.'

The article ends with illustrations of the readings of the Bodleian and Venice MSS. of the Protagoras. 'Bodleianus nullum correctorem nactus sed religiose ab indocto librario descriptus scatet vitiis erroribusque, quorum pars in Veneto correctae legitur non ex auctoritate libri veteris sed de Graeci lectoris coniectura ut plurimum non infelici.' After a long list of such corrections from the apparatus of Schanz he concludes by saying that if it was his duty to edit the Protagoras, he would make the Bodleian MS. with all its faults the basis of his work, 'deinde omnes omnium apographorum, non excepto codice Veneto, lectiones abiicerem, et solas probabiles coniecturas exciperem, et sic me melius de Platone meritum esse existimarem, quam si scripturas nullum omnino usum habituras quam plurimas collegissem.'

The next article is a continuation of Dr. Badham's *ἄρακτα*, and contains suggestions for the emendation of Demosthenes, de F. L., of Thucydides, bks. II and III, and of Plato, Philibus.

S. A. Naber then continues his notes on the fragments of the Comic poets contained in the 4th vol. of Meineke, to which he nearly always now refers by page. Two or three excerpts may be made. There is a fragment of Menander

discovered by Tischendorf which reads: τὸ δὲ λεγόμενον οὐκ ἔχεις ON ὑπὸ τῶν ἀγαθῶν εὐ ἴσθι. This passage Cobet emended, taking a hint from another line, οὐκ ἔχεις ὅπ(οι χέσης). Naber admits the ingenuity of the conjecture. But 'Menandrea Musa pudibunda est, sordes vitat, et ab spurcis jocus aliena est. Rogat veniam qui hic loquitur et honorem auribus praefatur; tamen desidero honestiorem proverbii formam et forte incidi in locum qui monstrare poterit id quod Menander mihi dixisse videtur. Legebam nuper Diogenis Epistulas, et contuli Epist. 38. καὶ δὴ ποτε εἰσελθὼν πρὸς μεράκιον τῶν σφόδρα εὐπόρων κατακλίνομαι ἐν τινὶ ἀνδρῶνι πάντῃ κεκαλλωπισμένῳ γραφαῖς τε καὶ χρυσῷ, ὥς μηδὲ ὅπου πτίσῃ τις τόπον εἶναι. Hoc Menandrum decet: οὐχ ἔχεις ὅπου πτίσῃς.'

'De moribus Getarum Menander dicit p. 232 :

ἀν τέτταρας δ' ἡ πέντε γεγαμικῶς τύχη  
καταστροφῆς τις, ἀννέμαιος ἄθλιος  
ἀννυμός οὗτος ἐπικαλεῖτ' ἐν τοῖς ἐκεῖ.

Loci sententia aperta est. Si quis quatuor tantum vel quinque uxores duxit, eius mortem Getae deflent tanquam adolescentis et coelibis: videtur iis ἀννέμαιος, ἀννυμός: hoc intelligo; videtur etiam ἄθλιος? non credo. Commonstrabam nuper hunc locum filio meo isque interrogatus respondit se suspicari sub corruptela latere adiectivum ἀθάλαμος. Mutationem exiguum esse vides, neque multum me movet hoc adiectivum praeterea non inveniri, nam pro re nata talia finguntur et satis est si analogiam servaveris.' But he thinks himself the true word is ἡθεός. It appears that Bentley for καταστροφῆς τις proposed to read ἀναφρόδιτος, and remarked: "Ex ἀναφρόδιτος librarii oscitatione natum est καταστροφή τις. Videsne literarum ductus et erroris facilitatem? Sententia jam qualis? Certe si de hoc dubitare audes, tota tibi ars Critica erit abjudicanda. Hic si cui Bentleii Britannum supercilium non afferre poterit iudicandi modestiam, nihil poterit."

In the last article of this number Cobet continues his remarks on Herwerden's edition of Thucydides, bk. IV. On c. 11, 2 ἐπέπλει Θρασυμηλίδας: 'ridiculum nomen est Θρασύμηλος et Θρασυμηλίδας, ut in Stobaei Append. Florent. Ὁξίθεος pro ΕΥξίθεος. Ut enim ὄξος et θεός numquam coalescere in unum potuerunt, sic τὸ μῆλον sive *malum* est sive *ovis* cum θρασύς componi non potest. Emendemus igitur Θρασυμηλίδας, ut Θρασυμήδης et Θρασύβουλος nota sunt nomina.'

On c. 19, 1, ἀμεινον ἡγούμενοι ἀμφοτέροις μὴ διακινδυνεύεσθαι he says: 'animadvertendum est discrimen quod inter διακινδυνεύειν et διακινδυνεύεσθαι intercedit. Διακινδυνεύειν est quod omnes novimus *in adeundo periculo usque ad extremum, perseverare*, ut in fine capitis 19: πρὸς δὲ τὰ ὑπερανχοῖντα καὶ παρὰ γνώμην διακινδυνεύειν. Sed διακινδυνεύεσθαι quid est? Ipsa forma declarat esse e numero verborum, quae *certamen* et *contentionem* significant, ut ἀπειλεῖν διαπειλεῖσθαι, βοᾶν διαβοᾶσθαι, τοξεύειν διατοξεύεσθαι, et alia sexcenta, quae omnia praeter διαπίνειν verbi medii formam assumunt et sic ex κινδυνεύειν διακινδυνεύεσθαι nascitur.—Est denique operae pretium in Scholiis ad hunc locum observare quam leves, quam pueriles sint Scholiastarum, quorum praeter nomina nihil novimus, animadversiones et interpretationes. Non sunt, credo, obscura verba Thucydidis ἀμεινον ἡγούμενοι ἀμφοτέροις μὴ διακινδυνεύεσθαι, ut cap. 20, ἡμῖν δὲ καλῶς, εἴπερ ποτέ, ἔχει ἀμφοτέροις ἡ ξυναλλαγὴ. Annotatur ad cap. 19, ἀμφοτέροις:



ἡμῖν καὶ ὑμῖν, ὥς Ἀντυλλός φησιν, ἵνα δοκῶσι Λακεδαιμόνιοι καὶ τοῦ τῶν Ἀθηναίων προνοεῖσθαι συμφέροντος. Satis levia et tenuia haec esse putes, sed vera tamen. Aliter visum Scholiastae, qui addidit: ἡ ἀμφοτέροις λέγει ἐν ἀμφοτέροις ἡ διαφνεῖν τοὺς ἀνδρας ἡ ἐκπολιορκηθῆναι ὁ καὶ μᾶλλον εἰκός ἐστιν. Haud vidi magis. Quod homini μᾶλλον εἰκός esse videtur manifesto pugnat et cum loci sententia et cum loquendi usu.'

Cobet finds as usual a large number of *emblemata* to eject. On these in general he remarks: 'multorum additamentorum simul originem vides: si quid apud Thucydidem alio loco de eadem re scriptum est Graeculi sedulo annotant in margine, unde facile in textum irrepunt aut ipsis auctoris verbis aut ad praesentem locum utcumque accommodatis.'

This part concludes with an 'index scriptorum quorum loci tractantur in vol. VI, VII et VIII.'

#### Vol. IX, Part I.

The first article of this number, pp. 1-32, contains a continuation of Cobet's report of the emendations proposed by Pluygers on the Latin authors. Many passages in Caesar, B. G. and B. C., in Livy, books XXI-XLV, and Velleius Paterculus, have corrections suggested for them. For instance: in Caes. B. G. V 40: *turres ADMODUM CXX excitantur*, he proposes *ad numerum*; in V 48: *etsi opinione trium legionum deiectus ad duas REDIERAT*, he reads *reciderat*; in B. C. I 54: *carinae ac prima statumina LEVI materia fiebant*, he writes *statumina alvei*; in Livy, XXIX 33, 4, *multitudine, quae NIMIO maior erat, Syphacem iuvante*, he suggests *dimidio*; XXXII 38, 8, *in servilem modum lacerati atque EXTORTI*, he corrects *torti* (σπρεβλῶθέντες); in Vell. Pat. II 11, 1, *C. Marius—natus AGRESTI loco*, 'restituit Pluygers verissimam Codicis lectionem EQUESTRI loco.' Here Cobet endeavors to show by quotations from Sallust and Cicero that Ruhnken was wrong in asserting: '*clamat tota antiquitas Marium sordidissima contemtissimaque stirpe natum esse.*' "Non satis cogitabant docti homines quam alto supercilio nobilitas homines novos, ex se natos contemneret." All expressions actually found are consistent with the belief that the family of Marius belonged to the equestrian order. II 32, 1, *cum—in contione dixisset—si quid huic acciderit, quem in eius locum substituitis?* "Ruhnkenius: '*praesens pro futuro, ut saepe.*' Non amamus praepositionem *pro* in talibus, et pleraeque ἐναλλαγαί de genere hoc nunc risum movent. Recte Pluygers *substitutis?* Plutarchus apud Ruhn. τίνα ἐξετε ἄλλον; et Dio Cass. ibid.: τίνα ἄλλον—εὐρήσατε"; it is not certain that Madvig would approve of this change. See his Opusc. Acad. II p. 40. It may be said generally of these emendations by Pluygers that while they are always plausible, and in many cases remove a real difficulty by a slight and probable change, they are not always convincing; and a few of them are nearly certainly founded on a misapprehension.

In the next article, pp. 33-46, Cobet continues his notes on van Herwerden's edition of Thucydides. He comments on about 70 passages in IV 55-135. On c. 80 ἡλπίζον ἀποτρέψειν αὐτοῖς he says: 'confunduntur passim inter se τρέψειν, στρέψειν et τρέψαι, στρέψαι. Ἀποτρέπειν est avertere, depellere a se immittens malum aut periculum, ἀποστρέψειν est alio convertere, facere ut aliquis alio se convertat, vim aut impetum alio transferat. Itaque hoc loco ἀποστρέψειν verum est, cf. IV 97, 2.' But few of these notes are of interest enough to be quoted.

Cobet next has an article, pp. 47-60, entitled 'περὶ κατεψευσμένης ἱστορίας. Ad Cornelium Nepotem.' It is not, he says, lapse of time that causes inaccurate reports of past events so much as 'hominum incuria et ἀκρισία.—Fingebant semper aliquid novi historici leves et futiles, Idomeneus, Neanthes, Duris Samius, Clitarchus, Phantias, Phanodemus, Acestodorus alique complures eisdem farinae, quorum errores et mendacia saepius Plutarchus redarguit.' In Themist. 32 Plutarch 'Phylarchi ineptum commentum redarguens ait : ὁ οὐδ' ἂν ὁ τυχὼν ἀγνοήσειεν ὅτι πέπλασται, utitur tamen eo teste saepius.' After referring to several stories of such a character that *κὰν παῖς γνοίῃ ὅτι κατέψευσται*, Cobet proceeds to the account given by Cornelius Nepos of the circumstances attending the death of Miltiades: that he was fined fifty talents, which he was unable to pay, was thrown into prison, and died there; and that his son Cimon was compelled to take his father's place as a prisoner, till the fine was paid with money supplied by Callias at the instance of his sister Elpinice. This story is told in substantially the same terms by Valerius Maximus, Justin, Diodorus Siculus, Plutarch, Seneca, Quintilian: that the Athenians treated their great general in this way; and then 'non alia conditione esse passos ut Miltiadis corpus sepulturae mandaretur nisi Cimon sua voluntate in eandem custodiam se daret, eumque tandem Calliae auro vinculis esse liberatum. Jam licet asperissime Atheniensium animum ingratum insectari, ἀλλ', ὧ τῶν, θάρρει, πάντα γὰρ ταῦτα κατέψευσται: nihil prorsus in his veri est; omnia haec sunt de nihilo ficta. Numquam Miltiades in vincula publica coniectus est, numquam Cimon in eadem custodia fuit, numquam factum est ut Cimon a Callia e vinculis liberaretur: πλάσματα haec omnia sunt, quae etiam nunc refelli possunt.' First Herodotus, ὁ φιλάλιθός, VI 136, tells us only that Miltiades died *σφακελίσαντός τε τοῦ μηροῦ καὶ σαπέντος* and that his son Cimon paid the fifty talents. Then the family was very rich: a passage in Plut. Them. 5 shows that in Ol. 74, B. C. 484 Cimon made a great display at Olympia: 'quantum igitur his paucis annis Cimon mutatus est ab illo qui inops Calliae nummis ex carcere redemptus est;' there are many other indications of the wealth of Cimon. But thirdly 'fac Miltiadem quinquaginta talenta neque ex suis bonis neque ἐράνοις amicorum in praesentia solvere potuisse, quid tum postea? num carcer et catenae? minime gentium, sed nisi ἐπὶ τῆς ἐνάτης πρυτανείας debitum aerario solvissent (Andoc. I 73) ἄτιμοι ἦσαν. Itaque omni iure publico carentes miseri circumambulabant, quod liberis hominibus satis erat poenae. Lex erat: τοὺς ὀφείλοντας τῷ δημοσίῳ δεῖν μηδενὸς μετέχειν τῶν κοινῶν (Dem. 58, 15).' It is clear therefore that when Nepos, Cicero, &c., assert that Miltiades and then Cimon were thrown into prison to secure the payment of the fine, they thus display ignorance of the Attic law. Cobet attributes this and other erroneous statements found in the Roman writers in regard to Miltiades to the authority of Theopompus; 'cernitur in iis Theopompi acerbitas et maledicentia et odium in Athenienses.' He discusses also another 'Nepotis παράκονσμα in Cimone IV 3: quotidie sic caena ei coquebatur, ut quos invocatos vidisset in foro omnes devocaret: quod facere nullum diem intermittebat.' After noting that it should be *vocaret* not *devocaret*, he remarks on the extravagant character of the statement: 'nugae hae sunt et λῆρος πολὺς.' No house could be large enough; and besides we have testimony that the houses of Miltiades and famous men of that day were of moderate size: 'pugnant haec apertissime cum rerum hominumque natura et pugnabunt semper

ἔως ἂν ἡ αὐτὴ φύσις ἀνθρώπων ᾖ.' Statements are then quoted from Aristotle and Theophrastus, which say that it was not to all the Athenians, but only 'in suos curiales (τοῖς ἑαυτοῦ δημότας)' that Cimon was thus generous. He was of the deme Λακιάδαι. It is probable that this was one of the smaller demes, on the scale of 'Ἀλμοῖς, of which Demosthenes (57, 9) tells us that it was 35 stadia distant from the city, and sent 73 δημόται thither on an important occasion, and that of these the elder men before the critical moment 'ἀπελελίθεσαν οἱ πολλοί.' We may assume therefore that 'οἱ Λακιάδαι, qui non mature rus reverti potuerint domi coenaturi, sed diutius in foro commorati partim ab amicis in urbe vocati coenabant, dum reliqui, quos nemo vocaret, ἀδειπνοὶ erant mansuri, nisi iis quotidie Cimon δειπνον ἐντελὲς parasset, quod et ipsum satis est liberale atque hospitale nec fidem excedit neque cum rei natura pugnat.'

The next article, pp. 61-103, is by S. A. Naber, entitled 'Aeschylea.' After quoting the statement of Dindorf that over thirty thousand emendations have been proposed for the Aeschylean text, and pointing out how much still remains to be done, he says: 'de Euripide autem ac praesertim de Aristophane num fabulae satis integrae ad nos pervenerint, in animo est propediem cum cura declarare quid sentiam; de Aeschylō et Sophocle, quum quaestio difficillima sit ac supra meas vires, tacere malo quam ineptire.—Video haud raro aliquid esse audendum et novi fortunam eos juvare qui aliquid suo tempore audeant; tamen mihi in hoc genere minime satisfacio et si quid proferam de Aeschyli textu emendando, id omne pertinebit ad leviora menda tollenda, reliqua ne digito quidem attingam. Ubi lenibus remediis nihil promovetur, rem relinquam Ritscheliis et Dindorfiis, quibus Cobetum accenserem, nisi ipse significavisset se tractare nolle quae pertractari nequeant, cum Aeschylum neque emendare possit sicuti velit, nec velit sicuti possit.' Some passages, however, may not be as much beyond hope as they seem: 'antequam recurratur ad extremum consilium, videndum num forte satis sit praesidii in remediis non alvum sed loci sententiam leniter aperientibus. Si frustra fuero, non deerunt qui mihi meliorem viam monstrabunt. Utinam comiter!' With these views he treats of some sixty-five passages in the seven plays. Space may be found for two or three specimens. The first note is on P. V 141 φρουρὰν ἄζηλον ὀχέσω. He will not allow that this expression is justified by the Homeric ὀχέοντας διζίν, etc., nor by Eur. Ion. 2, οὐρανὸν θεῶν | ὀχῶν παλαιὸν οἶκον, as Dindorf writes it, confirming his conjecture here by an appeal to P. V 430 (where however 'citus testis non respondet, nam ipse ibi primus coniectura haud verisimili participium ὀχῶν in textum intulit'). But taking a hint from Soph. Trach. 7 νυμφείων ὄτλον | μέγιστον ἔσχον, in illustration of which the Schol. quotes from Callimachus κενεὸν πόνον ὀτλήσαντες, he reads here φρουρὰν ἄζηλον ὀτλήσω.

P. V 667 κεῖ μὴ θέλοι, πυρωπὸν ἐκ Διὸς μολεῖν | κεραννὸν, ὃς πᾶν ἐξαϊστώσει γένος. On this he rejects Wecklein's remark 'mit μολεῖν (statt μολεῖσθαι) wird ohne Rücksicht auf die Zeit die Sache an sich hervorgehoben.' 'Equidem non possum verbis declarare, quam mihi contortae explicationes displiceant, et multum praestat fateri ignorantiam, quum suum sibi rectum iudicium corrumpere. Hoc mordicus tenebo: μολεῖν praeter aoristi temporis naturam hic usurpatum est': and so he proposes to write εἰ μὴ θέλοι . . . κεραννόν, making μολεῖν depend on θέλοι, and comparing Eur. Suppl. 126; I. T. 12, 608.

In Sept. c. Theb. 320 ἀροισθε κῦδος τοῖσδε πολίταις he reads ἀρασθε on the ground that 'in precibus ad deos utimur nisi fallor imperativo modo: contra ad mortales, qui ipsi non sunt suae sortis arbitri, in salutationibus et in imprecationibus plurimum utimur optativo modo.' He illustrates this doctrine by many citations, and explains the use of χαίρε and ἔρρωσο because we χαίρειν τινὰ κελεύομεν, ἔρρωσθαί τινα φράζομεν.

On Pers. 576, κναπτόμενοι δ' ἀλλ' δεινὰ | σκύλλονται πρὸς ἀναίδων | παίδων τᾶς ἀμιάντων, he admits that we may accept Dindorf's correction, ἀλὸς αἰνά, until something better is found, but proposes to read 'Ἀλοσύδνας, comparing δ 404, γ 207: 'nunc certe opella nostra Aeschilo profuit.'

On Suppl. 559, ὕδωρ τὸ Νεῖλον νόσοις ἄθικτον, he admits that the Nile water is often praised for its various virtues, but 'pestilentia Cahirae grassante ὕδωρ τὸ Νεῖλον non sane est νόσοις ἄθικτον,' and, according to Herodotus, in Egypt πάντα ἡτρῶν ἐστὶ πλῆα, 'sunt medici: sunt igitur morbi: haec ratio recte concluditur.' He thinks that the reference is rather to a belief founded on the statement of Herodotus, II 19, αἶρας ἀποπνεούσας μόνος πάντων ποταμῶν οὐ παρέχεται, that there was no dew in Egypt, and therefore proposes δρόσοις ἄθικτον. But he is not sure: 'alii videant; equidem nihil definio.'

In Agam. 17 ἕπνον τόδ' ἀντίμολπον ἐντέμνων ἄκος, he denies the possibility of explaining ἀντίμολπον satisfactorily, and proposes αἰνόμολπον . . ἄκος: i. e. 'lugubris cantus, quo cantu nunc quidem somnus pellitur.'

In Agam. 59 γόνον ὀξύβοον τῶνδε μετοίκων he suggests τῶν μαψιτόκων.

On Choeph. 142, τοῖς δ' ἐναντίοις | λέγω φανῆναι σου, πάτερ, τιμάρορον, he writes: 'nullus metuo ne quis hoc sincere scriptum esse existimet, licet interpretes quos consului ad orationis scabritiem fere conniveant, dum minime necessaria sedulo inculcant et ulcera paulo graviora vix digito tangunt. Verum fortasse hoc ne postulandum quidem est in perpetuo commentario, ut omnia menda et omnes vitiosae lectiones in clara luce ponantur: id tamen interpres praestare poterit, ut nihil afferat, quo lectoribus ingenium obtundatur potius quam acuatur. Hinc editoribus parata venia est, si ad hunc locum nihil adnotaverint: modo ne in posterum recusent scribere, αἰτῶ φανῆναι.'

In Eum. 429 ἀλλ' ὄρκον οὐ δέξαιτ' ἂν οὐ δοῦναι θέλει, he finds that his correction of ὃν δοῦναι θέλω has been anticipated by van Herwerden and Ahrens. But he takes occasion from Dindorf's εἰ δοῦναι θέλουν, to discuss all the passages in which that form of the 1 sing. opt. has been assumed, and concludes: 'nunc omnibus locis in unum collatis, ipse (Herwerdenus) fortasse ultro concedet, fidem illarum formarum fere nullam esse nec niti nisi unico Cratini versiculo, quem Suidae debemus, cum reliqui loci omnes qui afferuntur ab conjectoribus reficti sint et Euripidis illud εἰ τρέφειν admodum facilem correctionem admittat.'

This part concludes with an article by van Herwerden, pp. 104-112, containing about a hundred emendations of Procopius.

C. D. MORRIS.

HERMES. 1880. No. 4.

v. Wilamowitz: Excuse zu Euripides Medea. These studies contain a large number of observations on this piece, dramatical, critical and miscellaneous. Among the points which W. aims at establishing are the following: Euripides, so W. holds, handled the myth with astounding freedom. So, for instance, the murder of the children by Medea is an addition by Euripides himself to the tradition of the legend. As to the tradition of the text, W. notes a number of *variae lectiones*, which he considers to be very old, as old in fact as the grammarians of Alexandria. Such are νέον: κακόν 37, λέκτρα: δῶμα 140, εἰλεῖν: κτανεῖν 385. They are not to be explained as glosses invading the text, as Heimsoeth used to explain such matters.

Emendation W. considers necessary in vv. 910, 182, 727 and others. But such passages, as well as those containing interpolations, W. judges to be very few indeed, actors being responsible for some of them.

In the main W.'s critical remarks seem to have a conservative drift. So he defends the song of the chorus 824 sqq. in praise of Athens, both in its general economy and in details of phraseology.

It is not feasible in this place to give an exhaustive *résumé* of all the discourse and discussion contained in the article; it must be said, however, that it abounds in very suggestive remarks on the character of Euripides in general, and on methods of criticism and emendation.

As a matter of more general interest it may be noted that Wilamowitz on p. 520 (note), says: "Attention has been called to the fact by several persons that the 2d pers. sing. in passive must terminate in -ῃ for the old Attic dialect; the inorganic shortening of ε belongs to the Macedonian period, and whoever writes τρέψει ought to write τεῖ βουλεῖ. The Atticists of antiquity were determined by the usage of the 4th century (B. C.), and the modern Atticists by that of antiquity. Nothing more could fairly be expected in Porson's time. Now-a-days, however, the origin and development of the grammatical forms can be understood and must be understood. The special rule of οἶε βοῦλεῖ ὄψει, it is true, is mysterious in its origin; but hardly justified." Towards the end W. says (p. 522): Diese Excuse haben mich doch dazu geführt das zu präcisieren, wodurch ich meine dass die vornehmlich sündigen, die heute mit Tragiker-conjecturen und -editionen ihrer Meinung nach den Ton angeben."

H. Jordan of Königsberg presents three papers: 1. Preliminary notes on Theognis. J. complains that those who have read the MS. of Theognis which is now to be considered the best, the Paris MS., after I. Bekker, have done but scant justice to the accuracy and scholarly excellence of Bekker's recension. J. doubts whether quotations of the author found in other ancient writers are more reliable for critical purposes than the MS. itself.

2. Supplementary notes on the letter of Cornelia Africana Gracchorum. The main point of this communication refers to the phrases *deus parens* and *dei parentes*, which occur in that letter. Jordan distinguishes them from *dei manes*. They seem to have been conceived as assistants of the parents during their life. The term occurs both in other inscriptions and in a long one found at Rome, now published in C. I. L. VI, 9659, which Jordan quotes entire, and discusses in detail the term *dei parentes* occurring as follows: *diis Parentibus suis hunc lapidem posuit supremum semoto loco.*



3. Quaestiones Orthographicae Latinae. Jordan sets out by complaining that Latin inscriptions are not considered authoritative in Latin orthography as over against the MSS., so that even Keller, the editor of Horace, prefers *Paulus* of the MSS. to *Paullus* of the inscriptions. *Sallustius*, not *Salustius*, should also be written. In the Augustan age the usage varied between the ancient *Quinctius*, and the natural phonetic tendency for *Quintius*. *Dicio*, *condicio* instead of *ditio*, *conditio*, are now at last pretty universally received, and Brambach should not be undecided about *suspicio*. *Thensa*, however, or *tensa*, must for the present be left undecided. As for *thus* or *tus*, the form with the aspirate predominates from Cicero and Augustus down. Older Roman grammarians, moreover, derived the word from *θεωω*. Of course imaginary etymologies on the part of grammarians have often been the real cause for certain ways of spelling certain words.

E. Zeller: Zur Geschichte der Platonischen und Aristotelischen Schriften. These notes are supplementary to the full discussion presented in Zeller's *Phil.* of the Gr. II, a, 3d ed. 397 sqq. As to the *Crito* a further point of evidence in favor of its genuineness is the fact that Aristotle in his (last) dialogue 'Eudemus' imitated some features of the *Crito*. So a dream is told according to which Eudemus was to return to his home (i. e. die) in five years. This, Zeller thinks, evidently refers to that passage in the *Crito* (44 A) where Socrates speaks of a vision of a woman who tells him *ἡματί κεν τριτάτῳ Φθίην ἐριβωλον ἴκοιο*—referring to his death.

2. The Republic. Proclus, the neoplatonist, it seems, went so far in his criticism according to "inner indications" as to call in question the authenticity of the Republic. This at least has been claimed by a recent writer (Freudenthal), on the basis of Olympiodorus Prolegg. §26. But the perusal of Proclus' commentary on the Republic proves this view to be erroneous. The passage in Olympiodorus must really be understood differently from Freudenthal's view. To *ἐκβάλλει* we must supply *ἐκ τῶν διαλόγων*. The remark of Proclus seems to have been purely a formal one, the language of Olympiodorus being probably a trifle inexact.

3. The Politics of Aristotle. While of earlier quotations, references, etc., there are very few—the Alexandrian era having little taste for such purely political theory—it would seem that the Ethics of Eudemus (1218, b, 32 sqq.) refer to Aristotle's Politics, VII, 1, 1323 a, 23, cf. III, 6, 1278, b, 32.

A. Gemoll<sup>1</sup> writes on the relation of Iliad K to the Odyssey. He compares a large number of phrases, sentences, sentiments, and entire verses which the Doloneia has in common with the Odyssey. The entire communication is clever and suggestive. The matter brought forward is by no means of the stereotyped element of epic diction, and in conclusion Gemoll draws the inference that the author of the Doloneia worked into his composition reminiscences from the great scenes of the Odyssey. But G. goes further: he asserts that the author of the D. knew the Odyssey in a form and order which substantially tallies with the Odyssey handed down to us. The 24th book, however, is not represented.

<sup>1</sup> Gemoll has made no reference to Geddes, see *Am. Journal of Philology*, I, p. 32, fol.—B. L. G.

C. A. Lehmann continues his *Quaestiones Tullianae*, in which he discusses critically passages from *de domo sua*, *de haruspicum responsis*, *pro Caecina*, *pro A. Cluentio*, *pro P. Sulla*, and *Orat. Philipp.* XI.

J. Schmidt (Halle) has an article entitled 'Zwei getilgte Inschriften.' One of the inscriptions, in which the erasures occur, is to be dated 421 A. D. at Rome (C. J. L. VI, 1194), and the other a marble base discovered a few years ago in excavations on the Roman forum, probably to be dated 356 A. D. In both of these stones certain lines of Inss. are erased. Schmidt suggests that these erasures took place in consequence of a *damnatio memoriae* decreed by the Senate against the Consuls of these respective years.. He does not believe that *damnatio memoriae* was always connected with capital punishment.

K. Zangemeister (Heidelberg). Bleitafel von Bath. The little leaden tablet discussed was discovered at the Bath excavations March 31, '80. The inscription according to Zangemeister's deciphering affords a curious and amusing contribution to Roman private antiquities. It would seem that a landlord had missed the table-cover (*mantelium*) after a *convivium*, and on the tablet subsequently denounced the *convivae*, making them collectively responsible for the restitution of the missing article. The notice is cast into a very solemn form, being a curse against the malefactor or malefactors. The main difficulty in reading this inscription arose from the fact that the *caupo* wrote the several words in inverted order.

Zangemeister's reading is as follows (p. 591):

q(ui) mihi ma[n]teliu[m] in[v]olavit  
 sic liquat <c> com aqua ella . . . ta  
 ni q[ui] eam [sa]lvavit . . . Vinna vel(?)  
 Exsupereus (V)erianus, Severianus,  
 Agustalis, Comitianus, Catusminianus,  
 Germanill[a], Jovina.

E. Hübner, Citania. Hübner presents some supplementary notes to his former paper on Citania, and the antiquities of that section of Portugal, (reported in I, No. 3 of this journal). The inscriptions adduced are bare groups of very few letters in each case, which often seem to express proper names of native places or things.

Neumann (Halle), Heraclitea. Notes on a few Heraclitean fragments adduced by an anonymous Greek Father, and now found together with a MS. of Justin, under the separate title of *χρησμοὶ τῶν Ἑλληνικῶν θεῶν*, in a copy in the Tübingen University library. Of course the employment of such passages by the earlier apologists is often, as in the present instance, forced.

E. G. SIHLER.

---

MITTHEILUNGEN DES DEUTSCHEN ARCHÄOLOGISCHEN INSTITUTS IN ATHEN.  
 5ter Jahrgang, 1880.

H. G. Lolling: Nisäa und Minoa, in L's opinion hitherto wrongly identified. He finds the acropolis of Nisaia in the hill on which the church of Hagios Georgios stands; Minoa directly on the shore not far to the east.

A. Furtwängler: Statue von der Akropolis. A naked boy about fourteen years old, standing, right leg forward. Subject: Statues of boys were not uncommon on the acropolis, but it is uncertain whether this is the anathem of a Panathenaic victor or not. Portrait statues of athletic victors seem to have been rare on the acropolis, votive statues taking the more common form of the image of the deity than the portrait of the offerer. [While portrait statues of victors on the acropolis were always anathemata, at Olympia they were part of the prize; not until the first century B. C. are they dedicated to the god.] Style: Just before Pheidias (*a*) Marble is Parian. In Attica before Pheidias, Parian was used in statuary, after him Pentelican. (*b*) Color is used in archaic fashion, the scalp hair being a smooth colored elevation without chiselled detail. (*c*) Though one leg is forward, the movement is not reflected in hips and shoulders, hence the attitude is a little stiff. (*d*) Inequality of execution between upper and lower body, breast and shoulders being vivid with the detail of nature, hips and belly are flat and sketchy. (*e*) Ears placed too high. Of the various Attic schools just before Pheidias it may belong to that of Kritios and Nesiotes, and be a later work of their school; it is sufficiently like the so-called Harmodios and Aristogeiton in Naples (Ol. 75. 4). It is not of the school of Myron; the face is superior, the body inferior to Myron. F. comes to the conclusion that in Athens, side by side with the school of our statue, flourished one like the Olympian statuary. Such is the so-called Apollo on the Omphalos of Athens. This and the Olympian statues are greatly inferior to our statue in the head, which was the model for the head in the Pheidian, its direct forerunner, but in the body they surpass it. The great difference, also, in conception is that the Olympian statues and the same school in Athens throw the shoulders farther back and the breast more boldly out than in the school which gave birth to Pheidias. The same difference was continued in the perfect art of Polykleitos and Pheidias.

Carl Schaefer: Neue Seeurkunden-fragmente. We possess already so large a number that no important additions to our knowledge are to be expected. Date of the first fragment is Ol. 105, 4; S. therefore modifies date of Boeckh Urkunde IV to Ol. 106, 1. It concerns passages in Demosthenes, whose assertion in regard to Meidias 21, 25 is proved false. Contents are inventory of ships' furniture made by the new official; list of ships of the year; list of men owing for ships' furniture. The second fragment, almost illegible, is undoubtedly part of Boeckh I.

Arthur Milchhöfer: Untersuchungsausgrabungen in Tegea. The ruins of a certain spot had for a century been taken to be those of the temple of Athena Alea, according to Pausanias (8, 45, 5) much the largest and finest temple in the Peloponnese. The foundations of a temple were here excavated 1879, marble, Doric, peripteral, hexastyle (13 columns on the side) 18.61 by 43.67 metres, which is much smaller than the temple of Olympian Zeus, and slightly smaller than the temple at Nemea, and the Heraion at Olympia. Nevertheless, M. believes it the temple of Athena Alea. (*a*) It is the only large marble temple known to us in the Peloponnese, and (*b*) the very high and long platform, with (*c*) an outer structure. These features would account for the effect produced upon Pausanias. The passage in Pausanias (8, 45, 5) concerning the orders of

architecture, M. understands thus—the chief order was Doric; the Corinthian columns were within the temple (perhaps in the cella); the Ionic in some outer structure (probably a portico).

Johannes Schmidt: Ein neues Bruchstück des Edictum Diocletiani de pretiis. Fragment of a Greek translation of the Latin document, ψηφοδέτης = *tessellarius* or *quadratarius*; μουσιάριος κεντητής = *musivarius*. The later language distinguished in regard to mosaic between *tessellarius* and *musivarius*, the former decorating floors in arabesques and geometric patterns, while the *musivarius* decorated walls with figures.

A. D. SAVAGE.

MISCELLEN. J. H. Mordtmann: Metrische Inschriften.

C. Schaefer: Die attische-trittyleneintheilung. A trittys stone from Peiræus [δέιπε] Π[ερα] or ρας]ίων τριττὸς τελευτᾷ, Θριασίον δὲ ἀρχεται τριττὸς. What were these stones? Kirchhoff pointed out the true explanation. The crews for the men-of-war were draughted by demes, and on arriving at the docks, the demes were massed into the larger trittyes, marked off by these stones. When were the phylæ divided into trittyes? The stones point to the 80th Olympiad; perhaps due to Perikles. S. thinks the land force (τάξεις) like the naval was divided into trittyes; that the people, who sat in theatre and ekklesia in fixed order, sat by trittyes; and that before the middle of the Vth century the ekklesia sat in the Agora by phylæ, after that in the Pnyx by trittyes. There were 30 τριττάρχοι, mostly military officers; probably they were the 30 assistants of the ληξιαρχοι, who kept intruders out of the ekklesia.

U. Köhler: Beiträge zur Periegesis der Akropolis von Athen. I. Die Parthenos und der Parthenon. Each year the new treasurer of the goddess examined the inventory of the treasures furnished by his predecessor, and among them the gold and ivory Parthenos was the most valuable, yet in all yearly inventories known, nearly complete for the Vth century, abundant for the IVth, there was no mention of the Parthenos. K. has discovered it on four stones, and arrives at this view. After 385 B. C. the statue was taken apart in the last year of every Olympiad (the other treasures were examined yearly), and each piece of the three sections, statue, shield and pedestal was weighed and compared with the original schedule on a bronze slab. The condition of the Parthenos was not entered in the yearly accounts of the treasurers before 385. There had been two temple treasury boards (ταμίαι τῆς Ἀθηνᾶς καὶ τῶν ἄλλων θεῶν). The treasures had been largely consumed in the Peloponnesian war, and the two boards had been consolidated. After the war the board again divided (of course owing to the return of prosperity), seemingly in 385. In regard to the divisions of the temple, *Hekatompedos* and *Parthenon*, K. is led to reverse the view generally adopted since Bötticher and Michaelis, the documents proving that the Parthenos was not in the Parthenon, but in the Hekatompedos.

Ludwig von Sybel: Athena-Relief und Torso zu Athen. Two post-archaic groups of clad female figures standing in dignified attitude, with some slight movement in some of the limbs. The one was created in the Vth century, belongs to the "grand style," and is derived from Pheidias's Parthenos. It is

architectural in air, stands firm on one leg, and this is covered with vertical folds; the other knee moderately bent, draws the folds out. The other type created in the IVth century, of the "graceful style," is very common in our museums. To the former group the present relief belongs, though, individually, of the Roman period. Gods in votive reliefs are usually taken from temple-images, but treated in two ways: (a) modified so as to bring the figure into living connection with the other actors of the relief, or (b) it may be bodily transferred, standing isolated in the group. Our relief follows (b). S. compares with our relief three mutilated statues, and assigns all to a common original of the first great period of Attic art (Vth cent. B. C.)

Johannes Schmidt: *Reisefrüchte*. Notes of a journey through Boiotia and Phokis; mostly inscriptions; mostly unpublished; reported, not discussed. One from a Thespian temple shows what is remarkable, a city paying contributions to a foreign temple, in this case *ἀ πόλις Ἀθηνῶν* itself. Several Boiotian inscriptions establish a remarkable pronominal form, *οὔτο*- (without *τ*) in oblique cases, e. g. in this Thespian inscription, *οὔτω τῷ ἀργυρίῳ*. He discusses the locality of the temple of Zeus Trophonios, preferring to the accepted one the site of the church of Sts. Anna and Constantine. Trophonios and Herkyna worshipped together seem to have been replaced by the two Christian saints, also male and female.

H. G. Lolling: *Ausgrabungen am Palamidi* (hill near Nauplia). Excavations of graves of the humble of the same age as the tombs of the great at Mykenai and elsewhere. Description: a nearly horizontal passage (*dromos*), open at top, pierces the hill for a certain distance; in the wall at the end is a tunnelled passage (*stomion*) leading to a chamber. The stomion was walled up, the dromos filled with earth. In the filling of the dromos were about 100 potsherds, some undecorated; others with belts; others with decoration of plants and lower sea animals, the same decoration as from graves of the same age at Mycenae, Ialysos (Rhodes), Knossos (Crete), and elsewhere.<sup>1</sup> In the chamber were the remains of four persons lying on the floor, unburned, in no receptacle. One skeleton was in a heap; probably this was the first buried, and thus gathered up to make room for the later ones. With them were two little vases, showing traces of fire; also bones of sheep and goats. Evidently vases and bones had been put into the grave as remnants of the sacrifice to the dead. The bodies were probably not burned because rapid consumption by fire was too expensive for these poorer classes.

A. Milchhöfer: *Gemalte Grabstelen*. Remarkable is the entire absence of burial monuments of the Vth century B. C., steles, inscriptions, etc.; proved, for example, by the palmette akroterion, none of its Vth century stages being found on burial monuments. M. thinks that the custom of erecting steles and statues was not general in Attica in the VIth century. Those in our possession seem occasional, commemorating the untimely end of young people. For this occasional, extraordinary character of the stele he adduces various proofs. The farther we go back, the more universal becomes the family grave; this, no doubt usually on the grounds of the family, needed no inscription. [Those occasional steles seem to have been placed, not on top of the mound, but on the

<sup>1</sup> Exactly the same class of pottery is found in Cyprus.—A. D. S.



side-walls of the passage to the door.] The absence of monuments in the Vth century he explains thus. The mound was crowned, he thinks, by vases in the VIth century, the so-called Dipylon vases. These were succeeded by the black-figured *prothesis* amphorae with funeral scenes. A still later kind of apex was the red-figured amphora with marriage scenes, in which M. finds the much disputed *λειτουργός*. These clay vases crowning the grave were succeeded in Attica in the IVth century by the marble vases in the round and in relief. [M. rejects the universal view that the white Attic lekythoi show mourning for the dead; he believes it is the dead man bemoaning his fate and taking possession of his tomb—shown by his sitting in front of it—in the presence of his friends who bring offerings.] After the Vth century there were three chief forms of burial monuments in Attica, the *marble vase*, which succeeded in Attica clay vases; the *stèle*, which had been in occasional use before the Vth century, and the *aedicula* with relief, which is not earlier than the IVth century. In the VIth century the figure of the stèle in flat relief took up the whole slab. In the IVth century, with the desire for groups and action, only a portion of the tall slab was used, the figures of course becoming smaller.

Johannes Schmidt: Reisefrüchte (Schluss).

Arthur Milchhöfer: Nymphenrelief aus Athen, from the terrace excavated 1876-77 on the north side of the Acropolis, date Vth century B. C. The three nymphs of the spring in the grotto are adored by the offerer of the relief, while Pan half shows himself through an opening in the wall above. The face of the offerer is not typical, but is a portrait. In the burial and votive reliefs of the IVth century B. C. faces were made typical; before that they were individual. This is the oldest of our representations of Pan in Africa. He has not the brutish face given him in the IVth century. This terrace was the scene of worship of powers of nature—heroes, spring-nymphs, Pan, Asklepios. Asklepios was not at first the chief owner of the spring; not till the IVth century did he overshadow its other owners. Where we have reliefs of girls dancing or walking with Pan or Hermes, or about a bearded head of a water spirit, there is no need of calling them always Charites, for there were about the Acropolis three other cults of the same kind of subordinate female deities, the Three Dewy Sisters, etc.; the Korai of Erechtheum porch he regards as some of these well-nymphs of the Acropolis. M. lays down the following stages of development in shape of reliefs, votive and burial. At first there was no marked difference between the two classes in shape; they looked like a piece of a frieze, being framed at top and bottom only, and with horizontal top. In the IVth century a marked divergence; the votive relief imitates the side of a temple, the burial relief one end of a temple *in antis*. The presence of worshippers is not, as Stephani thought, a chronological test, for they appear in the oldest reliefs. As they must be smaller than the gods, various devices were employed to fill the vacant space, *e. g.* an inscription in the field over their heads, rarely employed in the later Attic votive reliefs. M. enumerates all the votive reliefs of Attica of the Vth century, none of which are older than the end of the century. Why are none found older? M. thinks that as in burial monuments so in votive reliefs, terra-cotta had been used. The framing (unarchitectural) and modelling of these reliefs show them to be the translation into marble of earlier painted panels of wood and clay.

R. Weil: Kythera, a topographical account chiefly.

H. G. Lolling: Altattische Herme. Lolling thinks he has discovered the original of Fount's inscription, C. I. Gr. 12, known as an inscription on a Herma of Hipparchos. In earlier Attic history and into the Vth century there were several kinds of Hermae. (a) Fingerposts with encouraging mottoes; such were those of Hipparchos (Plato, Hipparch. 228); (b) monuments erected by the state or private citizens to benefactors (Demosth. contra Lept. 112); (c) dedicated to a god; (d) with several heads. The inscriptions were usually in verse, and were mostly composed, not by Attic, but by foreign writers.

Reinh. Kekulé: Reliefschale mit Artemis, fragment of archaic vase gilded in imitation of solid gold vessels. Vases with reliefs are frequent in later art, this is the only early example known to Kekulé.

Richard Bohn: Bericht über die Ausgrabungen auf der Akropolis zu Athen im Frühjahr 1880, about the southern wing of the Propylaia on its west and south sides.

Ulrich Köhler: Attische Schatzurkunde aus dem Ende des 4ten Jahrhunderts, accounts of the treasurer of Athena 306-5 B. C. Koehler arrives at the conclusion that about the beginning of the IVth century the Epistates of the Proedroi succeeded to all the functions of the Epistates of the Prytanies (except that the latter continued to oversee the draughting of the Proedroi and their Epistates), keeping the keys of treasury and archives and the seal and presiding in the Prytanies, in addition to the functions hitherto alone assigned to them of presiding in Senate and Assembly.

U. Köhler: Basis des Karneades.

Ludwig von Sybel: Altattische Reiterstatuette. He enumerates several, probably sepulchral, regarded by Milchhöfer as marks of heroization after death, by Löschke as tokens either of victory in horse-racing or of knighthood.

L. Von Sybel: Der Bestand des Erechtheionfrieses.

H. G. Lolling: Neuer Grenzstein der Artemis Amarysia.

H. G. Lolling: Das Nymphaion auf dem Parnes. Grotto dedicated to Pan and nymphs. In the cave were many niches for votive offerings, and inscriptions on the walls above and below.

Dr. Mordtmann: Das Denkmal des Porphyrios, in Constantinople.

R. Bohn: Bericht über die Ausgrabungen auf der Akropolis zu Athen im Frühjahr, 1880, II.

U. Köhler: Die von Herrn Bohn auf der Akropolis gefundenen Inschriften.

R. Bohn: Zur Basis der Athena Hygieia, at the Propylaia of the Athenian Acropolis; discussing its position.

A. ΠΑΠΑΔΟΠΟΥΛΟΣ ΚΕΡΑΜΕΥΣ: ἐπιγραφαὶ Μελήτων Πιρήνης καὶ Ἀφροδισίας.

Ludw. v. Sybel: Zu Athena und Marsyas, unfinished relief on a marble krater, probably after Myron's group "Satyrum admirantem tibus et Minervam." The same subject has been found on a coin, mirror, vases, bronze statue, marble statue. These differ from one another in many respects, which Sybel explains thus: In transferring the design executed by Myron in free standing statues

to a flat surface, each copyist made his own adaptation. Out of these adaptations Sybel reconstructs the features of the original.

H. G. Lolling: Athenische Namensliste aus dem 4ten Jahrhundert, fragment from Athens, names of representatives of the phylae, arranged by phylae; assigned to 330 B. C.

K. Δ ΜΥΛΩΝΑΣ, Πανός ἀγαλμάτων, from Sparta, of Pentelic marble. Mylonas ascribes it to the younger Attic school. He appends a list of all the Pans in the museums of Athens, statuettes and reliefs, 29 in number.

Ludw. Gurlitt: Amazonenreliefs von Patras. Von Duhn had considered them originals with similarity to the frieze of Phigaleia. Gurlitt proves them to be exact copies in the Roman age. They supply one of the three lost figures of the Phigaleia frieze.

Ulrich Köhler: Torso aus Athen.

Konrad Lange: Die Athena Parthenos, an account of the circumstances of finding, and a description (dimensions, etc.) A discussion of the statue is reserved for the first number of 1881, to be accompanied by a photograph. The present article gives a small woodcut (with enlarged engraving of the back of the head) of this new copy of Pheidias's Athena Parthenos. It was found a little north of the Varvakion, close to the ancient north city line; in the ruins of a house of the Roman age, under a brick vaulted structure, evidently intended to contain it; of Pentelic marble; with its plinth, 1.035 m. high, the plinth 0.103 m. high, is an irregular quadrilateral. The statuette is unfinished behind. Athena stands on her right leg. Her right hand resting on top of a column, upholds Nike; the left hand rests on the upper edge of the shield, the lower end of which rests on the ground. She is clad in a long sleeveless chiton with belted diplois (no himation). The aegis has eleven snakes on its outer edge, two on the inner. The high central helmet crest rests on a sphinx, the side crests on winged horses (not lions as reported in the Bulletin de Correspondance Hellénique), whose heads are now gone. Within the shield the snake Erichthonios rises up to Athena's hand. Nike (head gone), 0.14 m. high, with drooping wings, faces neither Athena nor the spectator, but between the two; holds in both hands the ends of a long garland. The state of preservation on the whole is excellent. Numerous traces of color, *e. g.* Athena's eyes are rimmed with red; the pupils yellow with red border, the iris black or blue, the eyelashes red parallels; her hair yellow, probably a ground for gold paint. On the skin no trace of color.

G. Loeschke: Vasenbilder aus Kameiros. On an oinochoë the figures are black on a thin coating of white clay. With very few exceptions Rhodian vases of the Vth century B. C. are imported from Attica; there are other reasons for considering this oinochoë Attic. Nikosthenes seems to have been the one who introduced into Attica this class of black-figured vases; hence they are younger than the oldest red-figured, and are imitation archaic. Those individuals like the present vase, belong probably to the years just following the middle of the Vth century. The drawing shows a new type of statues in the Periklean age, a priest (crown and lustration twig) consecrates a statue of a naked man in helmet, shield and greaves. The nakedness excludes the soldier,

and suggests the athlete—it is the portrait statue of a victor in the race in armor. Appended is a list of all the objects found in the grave, that of a woman of the time of Perikles.

H. G. Lolling: Schiffsaugen, a large number of marble eyes found at the Peiraieus, no doubt ships' eyes, for they were found at the ancient docks, and it was the custom to make the prows look like the heads of certain animals, and ὀφθαλμοὶ of ships are mentioned (in two other senses also than the present).

H. G. Lolling: Monument aus Kyzikos.

A. D. SAVAGE.

---

ROMANIA. No. 34.

La versification irlandaise et la versification romane. In 1871 K. Bartsch intimated his belief in a connection between Keltic and Provençal versification (Jahrbuch, XII 5). He followed this up in 1878 (Zeitschr. f. rom. Phil. II 195) with quite a long article to show that there was 'ein keltisches versmass im provenzalischen und französischen.' In April '79 H. d'Arbois de Jubainville published in the Romania (No. 30) an article (a summary of which was given in the first number of this Journal) in which he argued that there were no sufficient grounds to admit any relation between Keltic and Romanic versification. To this Bartsch angrily replied in a note in the Zeitschrift (Bd. III, hft. 2) that Jubainville knew nothing about versification of any kind; and this charge he repeated in the next number of the Zeitschrift (heft 3) and gave a long argument to support his position. Jubainville now repels Bartsch's assault, prefacing his defence by saying that his opponent proves two things: 1st, that he (Jubainville) had contradicted without convincing him, and 2d, that "le savant philologue n'a peut-être pas dans les questions celtiques la même compétence que dans les domaines où il s'est acquis une si légitime réputation." Gaston Paris, who in a footnote to Jubainville's first essay had coincided with certain of the latter's views, came in for a part of Bartsch's criticism. Paris, therefore, naturally joins Jubainville in his attack on Bartsch, and between the two the latter gets the tables turned on him. It will be remembered also that Mr. J. M. Hart in the 4th number of this Journal (p. 444) expressed his approval of Jubainville's conclusions, at the same time giving a succinct account of his argument. The whole discussion is lively as well as interesting.

Les troisièmes personnes du pluriel en provençal. By Paul Meyer. The forms considered have a common characteristic, viz., the presence of an atonic followed by two consonants: *hábent, ámant, vídent*. The atonic thus situated is always preserved or leaves some trace of itself. The different cases that arise may be reduced to three categories: 1st, the futures in *-ent*, and terminations in which the atonic would form a hiatus with *a* of the theme, as *habent, faciunt, vadunt*; 2d, the endings of the present indicative of the first conjugation, of the present subjunctive of the three other conjugations, and of the imperfects of all the conjugations; 3d, the endings of the present indicative of conjugations II to IV (*-ent, -unt*), of the present subjunctive of the first conjugation (*-ent*) and of the perfects (*-unt*). The author studies these several

types historically and geographically, that is, he seeks to show *when* and *where* the various Provençal forms correspond with the Latin. His results are as follows: 1st, the termination *-unt*, to which *-ent* was early assimilated, is continued in the greater part of the langue d'oc under the form *un* (in the oldest texts), *on* or *o*, and in the Gascon and Limousin provinces under that of *en*; 2d, exceptionally *habent*, *faciunt*, *vadunt*, after having passed through *aun*, *faun*, *vaun*, of which a few examples are found up to the XIII century, subsist more or less late according to place, in the central territory of the langue d'oc (i. e. in Aveyron and the neighboring provinces) under the forms *au*, *fau*, *vau*, whereas in other districts they were *an*, *fan*, *van*; 3d, the Latin final *-ant* is preserved as *an* on the west bank of the Rhone up to about the end of the XV century, when it is replaced by *on*. The same change took place very much earlier to the west of the Rhone in certain provinces before the appearance of written documents. In Gascony and Limousin *an* became *en*.

Les congés de Jean Bodel, with glossary, etc. By Gaston Raynaud. The little that is known of the life of Jean Bodel is found in the *Congés*. He was a native of Arras, a poet by profession, and probably held a municipal office. He was a friend of the leading citizens, and was indebted to them for many favors. In 1205 he was to take the cross and start for the Holy Land. Everything was ready, but at the last moment he had to abandon his design, owing to the aggravation of a malady (leprosy) with which he had long been affected. The disease soon rendered him so much an object of loathing that he was compelled to retire from human society and live in solitude. It was then that he asked *songie* of his friends, who had loved and cherished him to the last, and addressed to them the farewell contained in the little poem, first published by Méon in 1808 (*Fabliaux et Contes*, I, p. 135-152), and here reprinted by Raynaud with a glossary and critical and philological notes. The *Congés* make a poem of 492 lines, which is preserved in seven MSS. of the XIII century.

Le catéchisme de Bonifaci, ed. by J. Ulrich. The catechism here published is a translation into Rumansh or Western Ladin of Johan Pontisella's *Catechismus Kurtzer Bericht der Houpuncten Christenlicher Religion für die Kirchen und Schulen*, and was first printed at Zurich in 1596. It is therefore one of the oldest documents of the dialect of the Grisons, the oldest being a translation of the New Testament made some time in the XVIth century. The translator of the *Catechismus* was a schoolmaster of Fuerstenau. Nothing further has been ascertained about him. His language is strongly affected both verbally and syntactically by the German. The same phenomenon noticed by Diez with reference to the Portuguese and Spanish (sporadic in Italian and Provençal), namely, the non-repetition of the adverbial termination *-ment*, is found in the *Catechismus*: e. g. *vauna et malnützameng* 210, *diligeinta et hümmelmeng* 1141. A peculiarity of the Ladin dialects is a great number of verbs in *-antar*, *-entar*, *-intar*, that is, participial formations.

Chants populaires du Velay et du Forez. Trois retours de guerre, I. La fille de l'hotesse; II. Le retour du Mari; III. Le retour du père. By Victor Smith.

In the *Mélanges* are continued the "Notes sur la langue vulgaire d'Espagne et de Portugal au haut moyen âge (712-1200)."



*Comptes-rendus.* J. Ulrich gives a sharp criticism of the phonetic part of Reinhardstoettner's *Grammatik der portugiesischen Sprache* (Strasburg, 1878). While the criticism in the points noticed is generally just, it does not give the author credit for the commendable parts of his work. R's grammar, though weak in many respects, is undoubtedly the best we have, and the only one that has undertaken a scientific treatment of the subject, and as such we can not but welcome it.

Gaston Paris reviews the second volume of Charles Aubertin's *Histoire de la langue et de la littérature françaises au moyen âge* (Paris, Berlin, 1878). The first volume was noticed by him in vol. VI, p. 454 of the *Romania*. His criticism of vol. I, while pointing out numerous grave defects, was not without considerable praise. He has little to say in favor of vol. II, which is marred by "une inexactitude constante qui enlève à ce livre presque toute sa valeur," and "est bâclé avec une telle négligence qu'il ne peut guère qu'égarer ceux qui s'en serviront."

Antonio Ive notices very favorably Franz Miklosich's *Ueber die wanderungen der Rumunen in den dalmatinischen Alpen und den Karpaten* (Wien, 1879) [extrait du tome XXX des *Mémoires de l'académie des sciences de Vienne*].

No. 35.

El canto de la Sibila en lengua de oc, by M. Mila y Fontanals. The editor says: El canto de la Sibila que en diferentes versiones conocemos pertenece á la lengua de oc. Nótese en él un movimiento lírico opuesto á la manera difusa y expositiva de *Les quinze signes*, si bien se ingirieron en él algunos versos de la traduccion de esta obra. De una version provenzal del canto (siglo XIV?) provienen las catalanas, la primera de las cuales ha llegado hasta nosotros, aunque en un libro de constituciones sinodales, sin título y aislada, mientras las restantes se nos presentan como formando parte de una costumbre establecida. The Provençal version was made from the Latin: *Judicii signum tellus sudore madescet*. There was also a French version, which was noticed by Meyer in the *Bulletin de la Société des anciens textes français*, 1879, No. 3. The Catalan versions here given are: A. versiones manuscritas, B. versiones impresas en Cataluña, C. version de Valencia, D. version de Mallorca. They are all characterized by extreme simplicity and clearness.

Essai de phonétique roumaine [suite],<sup>1</sup> by A. Lambrior. Voyelles toniques. Tonic *a* before *m*, not followed by another consonant, is changed into an obscure sound here represented by *ă* (in *Diez* by *ç*), as: *manducămus, mîncăm*; *laudămus, lăudăm*; *ambulămus, umblăm*, and so all the first persons plural of the first conjugation. In old Romanian there was a perfect which must have been formed under like conditions; e. g. pres. ind. *sémnăm* (*signămus*), perf. *semnăm* (*signăvîmus*), which supposed the process: *signavîmus, signavimus, semnamu, semnămu, semnăm*. Latin *trama* and Romance *deramare* have given in Romanian: *întrăma* (*a se întrămă* = *se remettre*), *distrămă*, (*s'effiler*), and *dărămă* (*crouler, démolir*). All through the present of the indicative we have tonic *a* becoming *ă*, except in the 3d person sing., which has *a* pure. This was caused by false analogy, says the writer; the people considered this *ă* of the first

<sup>1</sup> See *Am. Jour. of Phil.* vol. I, p. 509.

person (întrăm, etc.) as coming from an *e*, and as they said: apăs (appenso), apasă (appensat), văd (video = vedo), vadă (videat = vedat), so also: întrăm, întrămî, întrămă, etc. The imperfect tense: laudăm (old form laudămă) is only apparently an exception; it is, he says, to be accounted for by a shifting of the tonic accent: laudăbamus as in Spanish (cantábamos). The rest of the article is devoted to explaining numerous seeming exceptions to the law above enunciated, which always crop out at the wrong place, and carry with them the unpleasantness of weakening our faith in the most ingeniously formulated laws of the phonetists.

Contes populaires lorrains recueillis dans un village du Barrois à Montiers-sur-Saulx (Meuse), by Emmanuel Cosquin, continued from Romania No. 32.

*Mélanges.* Notes sur la langue vulgaire d'Espagne et de Portugal au haut moyen âge (712-1200), continued from Romania Nos. 32 and 34.—La femme de Salomon. Under this heading G. Paris publishes two Portuguese versions from the XIV century of the legend of Solomon's unfaithful wife. They were copied for him by Carolina Michaëlis de Vasconcellos from the *Livros de linhagens*, printed in the *Portugaliae monumenta historica*, vol. I, pp. 180 and 274 of the *Scriptores*.

*Comptes-rendus.* G. Paris reviews: *Le Roman d'Aquin*, chanson de geste du XII siècle, pub. par F. Jolion des Longrais, (Nantes, Société des bibliophiles bretons, 1880). The Roman d'Aquin, though dating from the XIIth century, has only come down to us in a "détestable copie du XV siècle, incomplète de la fin et mutilée du commencement, et où le sens, la grammaire et la mesure sont massacrés avec une barbarie et une inintelligence sans pareilles." The task of the editor, therefore, was not an easy one, and Paris's opinion of his fitness for it is: son travail est digne d'éloge en ce qui touche l'histoire, la topographie et l'histoire littéraire; mais il n'avait, pour remplir la partie philologique de sa tâche, ni les connaissances, ni les méthodes nécessaires.

*Il Tesoro di Brunetto Latini*, volgarizzato da Bono Giamboni, raffrontato col testo autentico francese edito da P. Chabaille, emendato con mss. ed illustrato da Luigi Gaiter, vol. I-II, Bologna, 1878-1879. Reviewed by Thor Sunby.

*Chanson[s] de Philippe de Savoie*, pub. pour la première fois avec préface et notes, par Frédéric Emmanuel Bollati (Milan, 1879). Noticed by P. Meyer.

*Chronique.* The following notes contain welcome information:

M. G. Paris prépare un *Manuel d'ancien français* (XIe-XIVe s.), comprenant une grammaire, une esquisse d'histoire littéraire, des morceaux choisis accompagnés de notes, et un glossaire. Cet ouvrage paraîtra à la librairie Hachette.

Notre collaborateur M. J. Ulrich va publier à Halle, chez Niemeyer, une *Chrestomathie rhéto-romane*, avec tableaux des formes et glossaire.

SAMUEL GARNER.

NEUE JAHRBÜCHER FÜR PHILOGIE UND PAEDAGOGIK. Fleckeisen und Masius. 1880.

## V.

40. Review of O. Meltzer's History of Carthage, vol. I, by A. von Gutschmidt (288-299). This work is characterized as one of the most valuable contributions to ancient history that has recently appeared, worthy to be ranked with Holm's History of Sicily.

The author has had the courage to stamp, as the outgrowth of Greek myths, many of the traditions that were formerly held to be original and trustworthy; but the reviewer thinks that in some instances these traditions have been unjustly suspected, as where the story of the Philaeni is regarded as the invention of a Greek rhetorician.

41. The question why Achilles is called *πόδας ὠκίς* is answered by W. Schwartz, in making Achilles a storm-god, whose lance is the shaft of lightning. S. gets comfort for his theory out of this couplet of Drake's Ode on the American Flag:

"And see the lightning lances driven,  
When strive the warriors of the storm."

But the point of view is somewhat changed when Achilles is made 'the swift-footed son of the sun,' 'the short-lived summer hero, born of watery clouds,' etc. (299-302.)

42. M. Wohrlab discusses the fragment of the Konnos of Ameipsias, containing a supposed eulogy on Socrates, that is cited by Diogenes Laertius II, 28, and found in Meineke Com. Graec. II, p. 703. He dissents from the view of Fritzsche, that *ὀλίγων* refers to the chorus, which is assumed to have been constituted of *φροντισταί*; he speaks of Dobree's Addenda to Arist. Acharn. 270, but strangely omits the conjecture *ὀλίγω-πολλῶ* there suggested, and fails to notice Cobet's change to *ἡμᾶς*; *καρτερικὸς γ'εἶ*, adopted by Kock.

43. G. Schmid proposes *παρθένεια δ' ἐμὰ μητέρος ἀμάτορος* | . . . *ἐξήψα* in place of the traditional reading of Eur. Ion, 1489 ff.

44. In interpreting Plato's Laches Th. Becker maintains, in opposition to the views of Schleiermacher and Bonitz, that the enquiry 'what is courage?' is meant to be serious in its result, and not playful, and in opposition to the view of Zeller, that the outcome of it is negative rather than positive. B. shows further that the Socratic definition of courage makes it simply a general notion without specific qualities to distinguish it from other kinds of virtue, and that its essence (as of virtue in general) is in knowledge. B. thinks that from a comparison of the definition of courage in the Protagoras and in the Memorabilia with the discussion in the Laches, it is apparent that Plato had begun to realize that the Socratic philosophy did not lead to a conception of the *unity* but of the *identity* of virtue, and that the Laches shows that Plato saw the necessity of formulating in his own ethical theory a unity that shall find room for the existence of the characteristic differences of separate kinds of virtue. This Plato attempts in his Republic. (305-316.)

45. Several emendations of the First Apology of Justin Martyr, by L. Paul, most of them feebly supported. (316-320.)

46. The Sixth Eclogue of Vergil, by W. H. Kolster (321-358). The opinion of Flach (Fleck. Jahr. 1878, p. 633), that this was one of the earliest written of the Eclogues, is defended by Kolster. K. holds the song placed in the mouth of Silenus to be a '*metamorphosendichtung*,' whose veiled meaning is the transformation of Cornelius Gallus from an erotic bard to a poet of nobler style, in distinction from the view of Flach and Schaper that the irresistible power of love forms the theme, and of Conington that this ode is a cosmogonical (vid. C.) and mythological hymn. To prove the correctness of his opinion, the writer enters upon quite a full discussion of disputed readings and interpretations, but loses sight of his original aim. Many of the comments are the echoes of Servius and of Wagner. K. dissents, apparently with good reason, from Ribbeck's strophic arrangement of the song of Silenus, but he emphasizes unduly the supposed imitation of a Greek model in the details of style and phraseology. V. 44 he scans *Hýlā, Hýlā, ómnē*, which is preferable to *Hýlā, Hýl'*, the traditional scansion retained by the Harper Lexicon, although it gives *välē, välē*, inquit, Ecl. III, 79. It is more than doubtful if K. will have any following in his interpretation of 56-60, from which he gets the meaning that Pasiphaë is *afraid* lest the bull may again find his way to her. Ingenious, at least, is the conjecture that Vergil's allusion to *Ascreo seni* in 70 is because the poem of Euphorion, translated by Gallus, was the '*Ἡσιόδοσ*, which is named by Suidas at the head of the list of Euphorion's writings.

47. J. Sitzler proposes to change the unknown '*Ἡσιονῆας*' in Strabo XIII, 627, quoted from Callinus, to '*Ἡιονιῆας*, Ionic for '*Ἰαονιεύς*, following a gloss of Hesychius. In Tyrtæus Fr. 11, 27, he proposes *πιφανσκέσθω* for *διδασκέσθω*.

48. E. Heydenreich gives a commendatory notice of vol. I of Poetae Latini Minores, by Baehrens. The critical apparatus is especially praised. (360-364.)

49. L. Hellwig discusses the first sentence of Chapt. III of Sallust's Jugurthine War, without clearing up the difficulties of the traditional reading.

50. O. Rebling adds a few words and phrases chiefly from inscriptions, to the stock of colloquial and post-classical Latin, e. g. *quare*=French *car* [vid. DuCange], *retro* combined with a substantive. It is hardly fair to give *circumvertere*=*decipere* from Plaut. Pseud. 541, when the reading is probably *intervortant*.

#### VI.

51. W. Jordan gives new interpretations of Iliad B 556, 7, Γ 229-33, Δ 62-66, 505-20, 618-803, O 668-73, and a discussion of *μεγακήτης*. The most novel interpretation is that of *οὐλιος* from *οὐλος* (cf. *δοῦλιος* from *δοῦλος*), and taken with *ἀσθήρ* in the sense of *fleecy, hairy*. Thus Hector is likened in Δ 62-66 to a *comet*. (369-378.)

52. H. Röhl conjectures *τροφῶνς* for *τροφᾶς* in Aelian *περὶ ζῴων* XI, 10, meaning the cows which suckle the Apis calf.

53. N. Wecklein gives a critical review of the second edition of H. Weil's "Sept Tragédies d'Euripide," and of the Hippolytus edited by Th. Barthold. The work of both editors is praised in general, but Weil is criticised for being too positive. Barthold, on the contrary, for not being decided enough. B. condemns as interpolations about fifty lines of the Hippolytus. As might be

expected from such a skilful critic, Wecklein's article contains many valuable suggestions. In Hipp. 950 B. takes *φρονεῖν κακῶς* as the result or expression of *ἀμαθίαν*, but Weil as dependent on *πιθοίμην*. W. decides for the latter from the use of *πιδέσθαι*. In 1070 Weil supplies *χωρεῖ* with *πρὸς ἦπαρ*, while B. changes *αἰαῖ* into *παῖει*. But *παῖει πρὸς ἦπαρ* gives a wrong sense. W. proposes *χρίει* (as in his Aias 938, where, he says, he has established this use of *χρίει*; but I have found no example of *χρίω* with *πρὸς* in the sense of *to sting*. *δάκνει* is a suggestion). In the Medea, Weil reads (1266) *καὶ ζαμενῆς φόνον φόνος ἀμείβεται*, which is changed with fine tact by W. to *φόνον φόνος*, i. e. *murder is exchanged for, ensues upon murder*. The Hecuba has received the fewest emendations. In 96 and 145 W. supposes that *ἰκετέω* and *ἰκέτις* may have been pronounced [and written] *ἰκτέω ἰκτις* so as to avoid metrical irregularities. [These forms from stem *ἰκ*, cf. *ἰκ-νέ-ο-μαι*, may have existed.] Weil's treatment of the Iphig. in Aulis disappoints W., based as it is on the ultra-conservative opinion that this play is in its present form substantially the composition of Euripides, and that the dialectic and metrical anomalies of the [spurious] epilogue are ordinary corruptions. A happy conjecture is *χάριτος* for *χρείους* (corr. *χρέους*) Iph. Aul. 373. W. prefers *βούλομ'* (407) with *αι* elided to *σοι βουλόμενος*, and to justify this elision he cites *πειράσομ'* from the recently found papyrus fragment. One of the happiest emendations is *ἰκετέοντέ θ'* for *ἰκετέοντες*, 1002; if this stands we have a new instance of the common gender of the dual. Our limited space forbids any mention of the emendations in the text of the Electra and the Orestes. W. gives a favorable notice also of a critical study of the Electra and of passages from other plays, by Vitelli. (379-407.)

54. K. Frey proposes *θερμόπινους* Aesch. Agam. 1172, *ἰκονθ'* [Bamberger has *νεῖονθ'*] Suppl. 355, *ἀσφυνκτον* *ibid.* 784.

55. P. Schröder conjectures *συγγνωαῖκα* for *σὺν γυναικὶ* in a fragm. (Nauck 614) of Soph. Phaedra.

56. L. Drewes on the Theory of the Dochmius (409-416). An interesting discussion of this much disputed measure, in which the author aims to show that the dochmius is a single metrical foot or rhythmic element whose lighter and heavier parts (*tactteil*) have no more right to be regarded as separate feet than, for example, those of the paeon, and that these parts always hold the ratio of 5:3. Further he shows that there is a fixed ratio also between the heavier or ictus part of each foot and the whole, and this principle as applied to the Dochmius (3:5::5:8) proves that this measure is the nearest musical expression the Greeks had of the perfect proportion in which the smaller part is related to the greater as that in turn is related to the whole (i. e.  $3 \times 8 = 5 \times 5$ ).

57. Carl Schäfer sends a communication from Athens on the *θιασοὶ* or private religious clubs in ancient Peiraeus. He criticises some of the views of Foucart's "Des Associations Religieuses chez les Grecs," and discusses several Attic inscriptions, more especially two recently found in the Peiraeus, one belonging to the second century B. C., and first published in the *Palingenesia*, Sept. 1879, the other, found by himself, and dating from Olymp. 119, 3, published in *Ἀθήναιον*, 1880. (417-427.)



58. M. Niemeyer examines the readings of several passages of the *Curculio* of Plautus.

# VII.

59. A. Kaegi gives an appreciative account of Dr. H. Zimmer's essay on the civilization of the Vedic Aryans. While Zimmer has drawn parallels chiefly between Aryan, German and Slavonic conditions, Kaegi refers especially to analogous Greek and Roman words and relations. A curious point is made on the adj. *anās* in *anāso dāsyūn*, which K. says may be analyzed as *a+nās=naribus non praeditus* or as *an+ās=ore non praeditus*, and thus be regarded as the original source of the statement of Megasthenes about the *ἄστρομοὶ ἄνθρωποι*, and of the *ἄνθρωποι ἀμέκτηρες* of Strabo (p. 711). Since Megasthenes speaks of the *φιλόσοφοι* (the Brahmins) as his authority, Kaegi sees in these fables of *noseless* and *mouthless* men the fanciful etymologies and scholastic interpretations of the Vedic priesthood. (433-469.)

60. Fr. Rühl concludes that Thucydides (I, 138, 3) did not mean to say that Themistocles was a self-educated genius, who gained no advantage from intercourse with others.

61. F. Schöll contributes a critical study of some of the most difficult readings of Catullus. He defends the unity of the Lesbia Ode (No. 68), especially against the view of those who divide the poem on account of the supposed difference of address (Manlius and Allius). To effect this he emends v. 30 *id mali* to *id mi, Alli*, and accepts a fundamental error, possibly an interpolation, in v. 11. Manlius is expelled, of course, from v. 66, and the entire poem is addressed to Allius. Lesbia-Clodia is held to be identical with the Clodia quadrantaria of Cicero, and the view that the Caelius of the poem is M. Caelius Rufus is defended. (471-496.)

62. A. Schaubé proposes to read *originem duxit* after *c Gabiis* for *originem* after *Messalam*, in the *Vita Tibulli* (Baehrens' Edit. p. 88).

63. An unfavorable criticism by E. Jungmann, on Herding's edition of Hieronymus and Gennadius 'de Viris Illustribus.' (497-499.)

64. Emendations of Statius, by R. Bitschofsky.

65. Etymological and Lexical Studies, by H. Rönsch. To single out a specimen of the former: *decumanus* is referred to an etymon *decuma* from *δαίω* and *κόμμα*, with special allusion to its meaning of *boundary line*. The lexical discussion is nearly confined to words like *grossamen*, *proripium* found in MSS. of the Latin version of the O. T., especially the codex Gothicus Legionensis. Instances are given of the confusion of *prae* and *pro* in compounds. From passages in Victor Vitensis it is shown that *subtilitas* had at that time the sense of *craft*. Several instances of confusion in the conjugation of verbs are given. Of abnormal futures *partibo* and *dicebo* are found in Victor. (501-509.)

66. C. Wagener, arguing against Th. Mommsen (Hermes X, 383), tries to show from a comparison of Dictys and Sallust that Cassiodorus imitated in his story of Telephus the style and expression of Sallust, and that nothing in Cassiodorus proves the existence of an original Greek Dictys. (509-512.)

67. W. H. Roscher calls attention to the fact that *uterque* and *ubique* have in classical prose the same position in the sentence as *quisque* sc. next after the

reflexive, after *suis*, and in subordinate clauses after relatives and interrogatives.

## VIII.

68. J. Sitzler in examining barytone substantives in *-ις* in Homer finds: (1) That where the syllable of the stem immediately preceding *-ις* begins with a *t-sound*, this sound is rejected in inflection in order that two successive syllables may not begin with a *t-sound*; accordingly Πάριος should be Πάριδος, but Θέτιδος should be Θέτιος. [The data seem insufficient to establish this.] (2) That where both *-ιδα* and *-ιν* are found in the accus., the former occurs before a consonant, the latter before a vowel. But from his enumeration of examples the outcome is only this: that no forms in *-ιδα* (and *-ιτα*) are found before a vowel, which is, of course, a metrical fact. (513-517.)

69. H. Flach contributes the variants of the most importance gained from a collation of the Palimpsest Messianus of Hesiod, as an addition to the critical apparatus of his Götting edition. The Palimpsest contains only the 'Works and Days' with a commentary of Tzetzes and a βίος 'Hesiodov. The Messianus is more valuable, Flach concludes, for the textual criticism of the commentary than of Hesiod. (517-520.)

70. A scholium of Donatus on Terence's Adelphi I, 1, by A. Koenig.

71. A. Grossmann defends the common reading προβαλλομένοις Thuc. I, 73, 2, translating it *citing (them) by way of excuse* [a rendering made very probable from the connection with μάρτυρες in the same sentence]. Thuc. I, 84, 4, 120, 1, II, 11, 7 (ἐν τοῖς ὄμμασι is supposed to be a gloss), 42, 2, 89, 5 (παρὰ πολλὴν changed to παράπλην), are discussed. (521-525.)

72. Emendation of Xen. Hellen. I, 6, 4, J. Richter.

73. K. J. Liebhold examines several passages of Plato's Philebos, taking exception to some of Madvig's interpretations in his Adv. Crit. In 14, 6 he proposes πολεμῶμεν for τολμῶμεν with which commentators feel bound to supply an infinitive of some sort, as though it could not be used in its absolute sense of *to have courage*. In 34 e L. would change διψῇ γε πον to δ. γ. του. Why change this πον, so characteristic of Plato in a question? The change of ξυμπεφορημένη to συμπεφυρμένη in 64 e, and the addition of ὁρμάς after ἐπομένους 66 e, may find acceptance. (526-528.)

74. G. Gilbert replies to Hartel's critique (Wiener Studien, I 269) on his former article (Fleck. Jahr. 225 ff.) written to disprove Hartel's theory advanced in his Demosthenische Studien, of a 'first and second reading of bills in the Athenian Ecclesia.' Gilbert claims that the testimony of inscriptions, upon which Hartel relies chiefly, is of no value in determining this point. The discussion hinges on the meaning of εἰς τὴν πρώτην ἐκκλησίαν which H. takes to be either (1) the first assembly after the session of the Senate in which the προβούλευμα was introduced, or (2) the next assembly after that in which the προβ. was presented. G. contends that (1) alone is possible. Hartel has not answered Höck's exposition of C. I. A. II, 76, according to which the Demos requested the Senate to bring in a certain προβούλευμα. When the Demos has given the Senate instructions to present a bill, must then the Senate first through

a προχειροτονία obtain permission to have this bill made the order of the day at the next assembly? (529-538.)

75. In Diodorus XX, 74, R. Arnoldt objects to κατέπαυσεν in the intransitive sense and proposes κατέπεσεν instead.

76. The trustworthy and genuine character of the speeches reported by Polybius is defended by H. Welzhofer, who believes that P. in criticising the treatment of speeches at the hands of Timaeus lays down certain rules to which he himself is true in his history. (539-544.)

77. Th. Plüss has an interesting study of Bk. II, 228-249 of the Aeneid, in which he shows the defective and confused character of this passage taken simply as a narration, but its effectiveness and beauty when taken as a rhetorical and lyrical composition, whose aim is to bring out the contrast between divine wisdom and human blindness. (545-548.)

78. F. Rühl makes an interesting comparison between an excerpt from the Laurentian MS. 66, 40, and one from the Bamberg MS. E, III, 14, which constitute, as R. believes, a fragment of primitive Gothic history. The author finds strong resemblances between these extracts on the one hand and the statements of Jordanes in his *de Origine et Rebus Gestis Getarum*, on the other. A detailed examination shows points of connection also with Justinus, Orosius and Dion. For the textual criticism of Justinus some new help has been gained, and traces of a hitherto unknown version of the Alexander romance appear.

M. L. D'OOGHE.

## RECENT PUBLICATIONS.

### AMERICAN.

Thanks are due Messrs. B. Westermann & Co., New York, for material furnished.

Hart (J. M.) A Syllabus of Anglo-Saxon Literature: Adapted from Bernard Ten Brink's *Geschichte der englischen Literatur*. 8vo, sd. Cincinnati. 50 c.

Plutarch's Lives. The translation called Dryden's. Corrected from the Greek, and revised by A. H. Clough. 3 vols. 8vo. Boston. \$6.

Price (T. R.) Methods of language-teaching as applied to English: three lectures. 8vo, 37 pp. pap. *West, Johnson & Co.* Richmond, Va., 1881. 25c.

Powell (J. W.) Introduction to the Study of Indian Languages, with Words, Phrases, and Sentences to be Collected. With Charts. 2d ed., 4to, xi-228 pp. Washington.

Virgil. Georgics; tr. into Eng. verse by Harriet W. Preston. *J. R. Osgood & Co.* Boston, 1881. \$1.

### BRITISH.

Aristotle's Nicomachean Ethics. Trans. by F. H. Peters. Post 8vo, 354 pp. *C. Kegan Paul*. 6s.

Badger (George Percy). An English-Arabic Lexicon. 4to. *C. Kegan Paul*. £9 9s.

Brahmo Year-Book. Ed. by S. D. Collett, for 1880. 8vo, sd. *Williams & Norgate*. 1s. 6d.

Caesar, Book VII. Ed. by Dr. Schmitz. (Chambers's London Series.) 12mo. *Chambers*. 6d.

Cicero. M. Tulli Ciceronis de Oratore Libri Tres. With Introd. and Notes by A. S. Wilkins. Liber II, 8vo, 150 pp. *Frowde*. 5s.

Cicero. M. Tulli Ciceronis pro Gnaeo Plancio Oratio. Ed. by Rev. Hubert A. Holden. 12mo, 310 pp. *Cambridge Warehouse*. 4s. 6d.

Driver (S. R.) A Treatise on the Use of the Tenses in Hebrew, and some other Syntactical Questions. 2d ed., revised and enlarged. 12mo, 330 pp. *Frowde*. 7s. 6d.

Garrick (H. B. W.) Mansukhi and Sundar Singh: A Hindu Tale. Roy. 8vo, bds. *W. H. Allen*. 1s. 6d.

Horace. Q. Horatii Flacci Carminum Liber II. Ed. for use of Schools by T. E. Page. 18mo, 104 pp. *Macmillan*. 3s.

Hoernle (A. F. Ldf.) A comparative grammar of the Gaudian languages. 8vo, lv-416 pp. *Strauss* (Bonn). London, 1880. 18s.

Livy. 5th Book. Edited from the Text of Weissenborn, with Notes, Appendices, and Marginal References, by Charles Simmons. 12mo, 172 pp. *H. Smyth*. 3s. 6d.

Müller (Max). The Dhammapada. Translated from Pali. (Sacred Books of the East, Vol. 10.) 8vo, 260 pp. *Frowde*. 10s. 6d.

Nicholson (Alx.) A Collection of Gaelic Proverbs and familiar Phrases, based on Macintosh's Collection. 8vo, 450 pp. Edinburgh, 1881. 10s.

Peile (John). Notes on the Nalopākhyānam, for the Use of Classical Students. 8vo. *Cambridge Warehouse*. 12s.

Plautus. Miles Gloriosus. A revised Text with Notes by Rb. V. Tyrrel. 12mo, 270 pp. London, 1881. 6m.

Redhouse (J. W.) The Mesnevi. Book the First. Together with some Account of the Lives and Acts of the Author. Illustrated by a Selection of Characteristic Anecdotes. Translated, and the Poetry Versified. (Trübner's Oriental Series.) 8vo, 300 pp. *Trübner*. 21s.

Robinson (A. Mary F.) The Crowned Hippolytus. Translated from Euripides, with New Poems. Post 8vo, 200 pp. *C. Kegan Paul*. 5s.

Vinaya Pitakam (The). Edit. by Dr. H. Oldenberg. In 5 vols. Vol. 3: The Suttavibhanga I. (Parajika, Samghadisesa, Anayata Nissaggiya). 8vo, 343 pp. *Williams & Norgate*. 21s.

Virgil. P. Virgili Maronis Opera. With a Commentary by John Conington. 4th ed., Vol. 1. (Bibliotheca Classica.) 8vo, 554 pp. *Whittaker*. 14s.

Virgil. Georgics. Translated into English Verse by James Rhoades. 12mo. *C. Kegan Paul*. 5s.

Xenophon. Anabasis. The Sixth Book; with a Vocabulary by John T. White. 18mo, 190 pp. *Longmans*. 1s. 6d.

Zeller (E.) A History of Greek Philosophy. Translated by S. F. Alleyne. 2 vols. Post 8vo, 1190 pp. *Longmans*. 30s.

#### DUTCH.

Gallé (J. H.) Gutiska. Lijst van Gotischē woorden. 8vo, 52 pp. Haarlem, 1881. 2m. 50pf.

van Eck (R.) Beknopte spraakkunst van het Maleisch. 8vo, viii-211 pp. Breda, 1881. 5m.

#### FRENCH.

Avesta, livre sacré du zoroastrisme; traduit du texte zend, par C. de Harlez. 2 édition revue et complétée. Grand in-8. *Maisonneuve*. 20 fr.

Baillet (Aug.) Le Roi Horemhou et la dynastie thébaine au III siècle avant notre ère. Gr. in-8. *Maisonneuve*. 3 fr.

Basset (R.) La Poésie arabe-antéislamique. 18mo, 87 pp. Paris, 1881. 3 fr.

de Harlez. Manuel du Pehlevi. 8vo, xii-351 pp. Louvain, 1880. 10 fr.  
de Pizan (Cristine). Le livre du chemin de long estude, publié pour la première fois d'après les manuscrits par Rbt. Püschel. 8vo, xxii-301 pp. *Damköhler*. Berlin, 1881. 6 fr.



Dictionnaire coréen-français, par les missionnaires de Corée. Gr. in-8. *Leroux*. (Yokohama.) 100 fr.

Dozy (R.) Recherches sur l'histoire et la littérature de l'Espagne, pendant le moyen âge. 3 édition. 2 vol. in-8. *Maisonneuve*. (Leyde.) 20 fr.

Durante. Il Fiore. Poème italien du trizième siècle en CCXXXII sonnets. Texte inédit, publié par Ferdinand Castets. In-8. *Maisonneuve*. 9 fr.

Feer (Léon). Études bouddhiques. Le Livre des cent légendes (Ararâna-Cataka). In-8. *Maisonneuve*. 4 fr.

Fragmenta philosophorum graecorum, collegit, etc., Fr. Aug. Mullachius. Vol. III, Platonicos et Peripateticos continens. Gr. in-8. *Didot*. 15 fr.

La Calle (Antonio de). La Glossologie; essai sur la science expérimentale du langage. Première partie: la Physiologie du langage. Gr. in-8. *Maisonneuve*. 10 fr.

Légrand (Émile). Recueil de contes populaires grecs traduits sur les textes originaux. In-18. *Leroux*. 5 fr.

Maspero (G.) Études égyptiennes. Tome I, fasc. 2, Étude sur quelques peintures et sur quelques textes relatifs aux funérailles; le conte d'Apopi et de Soknounri. Gr. in-8. *Maisonneuve*. 7 fr. 50.

Monin (H.) Monuments des anciens idiomes gaulois. Textes. Linguistique. In-8. *Thorin*. 4 fr.

Weber (G.) Le Sipylus et ses monuments; ancienne Smyrne. 8vo, iv-126 pp. Paris, 1880. 6 fr.

## GERMAN.

Abhandlungen f. die Kunde d. Morgenlandes. 7 Bd. Inhalt: Saptacatakam d. Hâla. Hrsg. v. Albr. Weber. Nr. 4. LXIV, gr. 8, 597 S. Leipzig. *Brockhaus' Sort. in Comm.* n. 32.

Aristophanis Ranae. Rec. Adph. v. Velsen. gr. 8, VI, 141 S. Leipzig. *Teubner*. n. 3.

Assyriologische Bibliothek, herausgegeben von F. Delitzsch und P. Haupt. I., 2 u. 3 Lfg. 4to, 45-132 S. Leipzig, 1881. *Heinrichs' Verl.* 15m. Inhalt: Akkadische und sumerische Keilschrifttexte, nach den Originalen im Britischen Museum copirt und mit einleitenden Zusammenstellungen, sowie erklärenden Anmerkungen herausgegeben von P. Haupt. 2 Lfg. Akkadische Texte. 3 Lfg. Sumerische Texte.

Ausgaben u. Abhandlungen aus dem Gebiete der romanischen Philologie. Veröffentlicht v. E. Stengel. I u. II, gr. 8. Marburg. *Elwerts' Verl.* n. 8. Inhalt: I. La Cancun de Saint Alexis u einige kleinere altfranzösische Gedichte d. 11 u. 12 Jahrh. 1 Lfg.: Texte. 80 S. n. 2. II. El cantare di Fierabracca et Uliuieri. Italienische Bearbeitg. der Chanson de geste Fierabras. Hrsg. v. E. Stengel. Vorausgeschickt ist e. Abhandlg. v. C. Buhlmann: Die Gestaltung der Chanson de geste Fierabras im Italienischen. XLIII, 191 S. n. 6.

Bauk (Ludw.) De proverbii aliisque locutionibus ex usu vitae communis petitis apud Aristophanem comicum. Diss. gr. 8, 88 S. Königsberg, 1880. *Beyer*. baar n. 1. 20.

Baumann (Dr. J.) De arte metrica Catulli. 4, 22 S. Landsberg a/W. *Schaeffer & Co.* baar n. 1.

Becker (Fd.) Die heidnische Weiheformel D M [Diis manibus sc. sacrum] auf altchristlichen Grabsteinen. Mit vielen Abbildgn. 8vo, 68 pp. Gera, 1881. *Reisewits.* 2m. 40pf.

Benfey (Thdr.) Behandlung d. auslautenden *a* in *ná*, 'wie' u. *ná*, 'nicht' im Rigveda. gr. 4, 48 S. Göttingen. *Dieterich's Verl.* n. 2. 40.

Bernays (Jac.) Phokion u. seine neuern Beurtheiler. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der griech. Philosophie u. Politik. gr. 8, III, 139 S. Berlin. *Herts.* n. 4.

Bibliothek, altfranzösische, hrsg. v. Prof. Dr. Wendelin Foerster. 4 Bd. 8. Heilbronn. *Henninger.* n. 6. 1, 2 u. 4.: n. 15. 60. Inhalt: Lothringischer Psalter [Bibl. Mazarine No. 798], altfranzös. Uebersetzg. d. XIV. Jahrh., m. e. grammat. Einleitg., enth. die Grundzüge der Grammatik d. altlothring. Dialects, u. e. Glossar zum ersten Mal hrsg. v. Frdr. Apfelstedt. LXIII, 177 S.

Bibliothek indogermanischer Grammatiken, bearb. v. F. Bücheler, B. Delbrück, K. Foy, etc. 1 Bd. gr. 8. Leipzig. *Breithopf & Härtel.* n. 4. 50; geb n.n. 6. Inhalt: Grundzüge der Phonetik zur Einführung in das Studium der Lautlehre der indogermanischen Sprachen v. Ed. Sievers. 2. wesentlich umgearb. u. verm. Aufl. der "Grundzüge der Lautphysiologie." XV, 224 S.

Bindseil (Dr. Th.) Die antiken Gräber Italiens. 1 Thl. Die Gräber der Etrusker. 4., 52 S. Schneidemühl. Berlin. *Calvary & Co.* baar n. 2. 40.

Birt (Thdr.) Elpides. Eine Studie zur Geschichte der griech. Poesie. 8, VIII, 126 S. Marburg. *Elwert's Verl.* n. 1. 60.

Böhtlingk (Otto). Sanskrit-Wörterbuch in kürzerer Fassung. 2 Thl. 2 Lfg. Imp.-4, IV, 161-301 S. St. Petersburg. Leipzig. *Voss' Sort.* n. 4. I-II, 2.: n. 19. 90.

Brentano (Dr. E.) Zur Lösung der trojanischen Frage. gr. 8, VI, 138 S. Heilbronn. *Henninger.* n. 3. 50.

Breska (Adf. v.) Untersuchungen üb. die Quellen d. Polybios im 3 Buche. Dissertation. gr. 8, 98 S. Berlin, 1880. *Mayer & Müller.* baar n. 1. 60.

Büdinger (Max). Cicero u. der Patriciat. Eine staatsrechtl. Untersuchg. Imp.-4. 66 S. Wien. *Gerold's Sohn in Comm.* n. 3. 20.

Budinszky (Alx.) Die Ausbreitung der lateinischen Sprache über Italien und die Provinzen des römischen Reiches. 8vo, XII, 267 S. Berlin, 1881. *Herts.* 6m.

Busse (Adf.) De praesidiis Aristotelis Politica emendandi. Diss. gr. 8, 50 S. Berlin. *Mayer & Müller.* baar n. 1. 20.

Calvary's philologische u. archäologische Bibliothek. 50 u. 51 Bd. 8. Berlin. *Calvary & Co.* n. 4. Inhalt: Vorlesungen üb. lateinische Sprachwissenschaft v. vorm. Prof. Chrn. Karl Reisig m. den Anmerkgn. v. vorm. Prof. Frdr. Haase. Unter Benutzg. der hinterlassenen Manuscripte neu bearb. v. Prof. Herm. Hagen. 2 u. 3 Thl. 1 Bd. VII, 209-427 S.

Cassel (Paulus). Drachenkämpfe. I. Archäologische u. mytholog. Ausleggn. 2 Ausg. gr. 8, 115 S. Berlin, 1878. *Wohlgemuth.* n. 1. 50.

Cassel (Paulus). Die Inschrift d. Altares zu Athen. Eine wissenschaftl. Auslegg. Mit e. Orig.-Zeichng. in Holzschn. 2 Ausg. gr. 8, 60 S. Ebd. 1878. n. 1.

Claus (Dr. Adf.) De Dianae antiquissima apud Graecos natura. gr. 8, 105 S. Breslau. *Köhler.* n. 1. 50.

Dieterici (Fr.) Arabisch-deutsches Handwörterbuch zum Koran u. Thier u. Mensch. gr. 8, IV, 180 S. Leipzig. *Hinrichs' Verl.* n. 5. 50.

Dieterici (Fr.) Thier u. Mensch vor dem König der Genien. Ein arab. Märchen, im Urtext hrsg. 2 Ausg. gr. 8, IV, 146 S. n. 4. 50.

Dissertationes philologicae Argentoratenses selectae. Vol. III et IV. gr. 8. Strassburg, 1880. *Trübner.* n. 12.

Draeger (A.) Historische Syntax der lateinischen Sprache. 2 Bd. 2 Aufl. gr. 8, XXII, 870 S. Leipzig. *Teubner.* n. 14.

Dümichen (Johs.) Die kalendarischen Opferfest-Listen im Tempel v. Medinet-Habu. 10 autogr. Taf. Fol. 16 S. Leipzig. *Hinrichs' Verl.* In Mappe. n. 30.

Elter (Ant.) De Joannis Stobaei codice Photiano. gr. 8, 75 S. Bonn. *Strauss.* baar n. 2.

Fabricius (B.) Die Elegien d. Albius Tibullus u. einiger Zeitgenossen erklärt. gr. 8, XII, 149 S. Berlin. *Nicolai's Verl.* n. 2. 50.

Ferrini (E. C.) Quid conferat ad juris criminalis historiam Homericorum Hesiodorumque poematum studium. gr. 8, 48 S. Berlin. *Calvary & Co.* baar n. 1. 80.

Floigl (Vict.) Cyrus u. Herodot nach den neugefundenen Keilinschriften. gr. 8, V, 197 S. Leipzig. *Friedrich.* n. 6.

Francke (Kuno). De hymni in Cererem Homericı compositione, dictione, aetate. 4, 28 S. Kiel (v. Maack). baar n. 1. 20.

Hartmann (v. Owe). Diu maere vom armen Heinrich. (Handschriften-Facsimile-Ausgabe im Gewande des 12 Jahrhunderts.) 8vo, 32 pp. Keil, 1881. *Lipsius & Tischer.* 8m.

Heidenheimer (Heinr.) Petrus Martyr u. sein Opus epistolarum. gr. 8, IV, 216 S. Berlin. *Seehagen.* n. 4. 50.

Heinemann (Karl). Über das Hrabanische Glossar. gr. 8, V, 92 S. Halle. *Niemeyer.* n. 2. 40.

Heinzel (Rch.) Beschreibung der isländischen Saga. 8vo, 204 pp. Wien, 1880. *Gerold's Sohn.* 3m. 40pf.

Hempel (Otto). Quaestiones Theocriteae. gr. 8, 98 S. Keil. *Lipsius & Tischer.* n. 2.

Hertz (Mart.) Ad Joannem Vahlen epistula. 4, 8 S. Breslau. *Köhler.* baar n.n. —50.

Herzog (Ernst). Üb. die Glaubwürdigkeit der aus der römischen Republik bis zum J. 387 d. St. überlieferten Gesetze. 4, 43 S. Tübingen. *Fues.* baar n. 2. 20.

Hopkins (E. W.) The mutual relations of the four castes according to the Mānavadharmasāstram. gr. 8, VI, 114 S. Leipzig. *Breitkopf & Härtel.* n. 2. 50.

Hoernes (Mr.) Alterthümer der Hercegovina. 8vo, 124 pp. Wien, 1881. *Gerold's Sohn.* 2m. 50pf.

Ja'is' (Ibn.) Commentar zu Zamachs'ari's Mufaṣṣal. Nach den Handschriften herausgegeben von G. Jahn. 5 Heft. 4to, 641–800 S. Leipzig, 1880. *Brockhaus' Sort. u. Antiq.* 12m.

Kautsch (Emil). Ueber die Derivate des Stammes צַרַק im alttestamentlichen Sprachgebrauch. 4to, 59 pp. Tübingen, 1881. *Fues.* 3m.

Klimke (Dr.) Diodorus Siculus u. die römische Annalistik. 4, 40 S. Königshütte. *Lowack*. n. 2.

Klinkenberg (Jos.) De Euripideorum prologorum arte et interpolatione. gr. 8, 109 S. Bonn. *Marcus*. n. 2.

Kvičala (J.) Neue Beiträge zur Erklärung der Aeneis. Svo, VIII, 463 pp. Prag, 1881. *Tempsky*. 8m.

Lambel (Hans). e. neuentdecktes Blatt e. Heliandhandschrift. Lex.-8, 14 S. Wien. *Gerold's Sohn in Comm.* n.n. — 90.

Lenz (Emil). Das Synedrium der Bundesgenossen im 2 athenischen Bunde. Diss. gr. 8, 69 S. Elbing, 1880. Königsberg. *Beyer*. baar n. 1. 20.

Löschhorn (Dr. Karl). Zur Entstehung d. griechischen Volkes. 8, 4 S. Wittenberg. *Zimmermann*. n. — 20.

Löschhorn (Dr. Karl). De notione Dei Aeschylea et patrum ecclesiasticorum. Commentatio critico-theologica. gr. 8, 23 S. Ebd. 1879. 1. 50.

Löschhorn (Dr. Karl). Quaestiones lyricae et tragicae. gr. 8, 37 S. Strassburg, 1871. Ebd. 1. 50.

Löschhorn (Dr. Karl). Kritische Studien zur platonischen u. christlichen Ethik. gr. 4, 40 S. Ebd. 1880. — 75.

Luebbert (Ed.) De Pindari carmine Olympico decimo. 4, 27 S. Kiel. *Univ.-Buchh.* baar n. 1. 20.

Luebbert (Geo.) De amnestia anno CCCCIH a. Chr. n. ab Atheniensibus decreta. Dissertatio. gr. 8, 93 S. Kiel. v. *Maack*. baar n. 2.

Luehr (Geo.) De P. Papinio Statio in silvis priorum poetarum romanorum imitatore. Dissert. gr. 8, 58 S. Brunsbergae, 1880. Königsberg. *Beyer*. baar n. 1. 20.

Mahn (Prof. Dr. A.) Üb. die Entstehung der italiänischen Sprache. 8, 40 S. Berlin. *Dümmler's Verl.* baar n. 1.

Marquardt (Joach.) u. Mommsen (Thdr.) Handbuch der römischen Alterthümer. 4 Bd. gr. 8. Leipzig. *Hirzel*. n. 11. Inhalt: Römische Staatsverwaltung v. Joach. Marquardt. 1 Bd. 2 Aufl. XII, 584 S.

Maurer (Alx.) Die Wiederholung als Princip der Bildung von Relativsätzen im Althochdeutschen. Svo, 32 pp. Genf, 1880. *Müller*. 1m.

Metzke (Ernst). Der Dialect v. Ile-de-France im XIII u. XIV Jahrh. 1 Thl.: Vocalismus [1. Vocale]. Dissert. gr. 8, 31 S. Breslau, 1880. *Koebner*. baar n. 1.

Meyer (Paul). Untersuchung üb. die Frage der Echtheit d. Briefwechsels Cicero ad Brutum. Dissert. gr. 8, VIII, 210 S. Stuttga. *Knapp*. n. 2. 40.

Neumann (Herm.) De Plinii dubii sermonis libris Charisii et Prisciani fontibus. gr. 8, 61 S. Kiel. *Lipsius & Tischer*. n. 2.

Oesterley (Herm.) Historisch-geographisches Wörterbuch d. deutschen Mittelalters. (In ca. 12 Lfgn.) 1 Lfg. Lex.-8. 80 S. Gotha. *J. Perthes*. n. 2. 40.

Ossowski (Jul. J.) Üb. den lautwerth einiger palatale im sanskrit. Dissert. gr. 8, 32 S. Königsberg, 1880. *Beyer*. baar n. 1.

Paucker (C.) De latinitate B. Hieronymi. Editio adjecto indice auctior. gr. 8, IV, 189 S. Berlin, 1880. *Calvary & Co.* baar n. 10.

Pfizmaier (Aug.) Die japanischen Werke aus den Sammlungen der Häuser. Imp.-4. 98 S. Wien. *Gerold's Sohn in Comm.* n. 4.

Pfitzner (W.) Geschichte der römischen Kaiserlegionen von Augustus bis Hadrianus. gr. 8, VI, 290 S. Leipzig. *Teubner*. n. 6. 40.

Platonis opera quae feruntur omnia. Ad codices denuo collatos ed. Mart. Schanz. Vol. VIII. gr. 8, X, 165 S. Leipzig. *B. Tauchnitz*. n. 5.

Pratje (H.) Dativ u. Instrumentalis im Heliand. gr. 8, 75 S. Sobernheim. 1880. Göttingen. *Deuerlich*. n. 1. 20.

Quiel (K.) Der Gebrauch des Konjunktivs in den ältesten französischen Sprachdenkmälern bis zum Rolandsliede einschliesslich. 8vo, 42 pp. Kiel, 1881. v. *Maack*. 1m. 20pf.

Rigveda (der) von Alfr. Ludwig. IV-Bd. Commentar zur Rigveda-Uebersetzung. I. Thl. 8vo, XXXVIII, 435 pp. Prag, 1881. *Tempisky*. 12m.

Rothe (Carol.) Quaestiones grammaticae ad usum Plauti potissimum et Terentii spectantes. II. 4, 36 S. Berlin. *Calvary & Co.* baar n. 2. I. et II.: n. 3. 20.

Saalfeld (G. A.) C. Julius Cäsar. Sein Verfahren gegen die gall. Stämme. gr. 8, 34 S. Hannover. *Hahn*. n. —80.

Sa'adja b. Jûsuf al-Fajjûmi. Kitâb al-Amânât wa'l-I'tiqâdât. Herausg. von S. Landauer. 8vo, XXI, 320 pp. Leiden, 1881. *Brill*. 8m.

Sachau (Ed.) Üb. die Lage v. Tigranokerta. Mit 2 (chromolith.) Karten. gr. 4, 92 S. Berlin. *Dümmler's Verl.* n. 5.

Salomon v. Orbino (R.) Ohel Moed. Hebräische Synonyma. Hrsg. v. Jonas Willheimer. (In hebr. Sprache.) gr. 8, IV, 355 S. Wien. *Löwy*. baar n. 5.

Schlichteisen (Joa.) De fide historica Silii Italici quaestiones historicae et philologicae. Dissert. gr. 8, 129 S. Königsberg. *Hartung*. n. 1. 80.

Schmidt (Prof. Mor.) Commentatio de columna Xanthica. 4, 12 S. Jena. *E. Frommann's Verl.* baar n. —50.

Schrader (E.) Assyrisches Syllabar, für den Gebrauch in seinen Vorlesungen zusammengestellt. Mit den Jagdinschriften Asurbanipal's in Anlage. 1 Taf. 4to, 8 pp. Berlin, 1880. *Dümmler's Verl.* 2m.

Schulbaum (Moses). Allgemeines vollständiges neuhebräisch-deutsches Wörterbuch. (In hebr. Sprache.) gr. 8, IV, 299 S. Lemberg, 1880. Wien. *Löwy*. baar n. 4. 40.

Sievers (Ed.) Der Heliand und die angelsächsische Genesis. 8vo, 49 pp. Halle, 1875. *Niemeyer*. 1m. 50pf.

Steinthal (Prof. Dr. H.) Abriss der Sprachwissenschaft 1 Thl. Die Sprache im Allgemeinen. A. u. d. T.: Einleitung in die Psychologie u. Sprachwissenschaft. 2. m. Zusätzen verseh. Aufl. 2 Abtlg. gr. 8, XXV, 401—496 S. Berlin. *Dümmler's Verl.* n. 1. 50. 1 Thl. cplt.: n. 9.

Steinthal (Prof. Dr. H.) Einleitung in die Psychologie u. Sprachwissenschaft. Zusätze zur 1. Aufl. gr. 8, 9 S. Berlin. *Dümmler's Verl.* n. —50.

Steup (Ob.-Biblioth. Dr. Jul.) Thukydideische Studien. 1 Hft. gr. 8, VII, 92 S. Freiburg i/Br. *Mohr*. n. 2. 40.

Storm (J.) Englische Philologie. Vom Verf. für das deutsche Publikum bearbeitet. I. Die lebende Sprache. 8vo, XVI, 468 pp. Heilbronn, 1881. *Henninger*. 9m.

Susemihl (F.) De Magnorum Moraliurn codice Vaticano 1342. gr. 4, 15 S. Berlin. *Calvary & Co.* baar n. 1. 20.

Taciti (Cornelii). De vita et moribus Iulii Agricolae liber. Rec. J. J. Cornelissen. gr. 8, 40 S. Leiden. *Brill*. n.n. 1. 25.



Tedeschi (M.) Thesaurus synonymorum linguae hebraicae. 8vo, 327 pp. Padova, 1880. Wien. *Loewy*. 3m. 40pf.

Teichmüller (Prof. Gust.) Literarische Fehden im vierten Jahrhundert vor Chr. [Chronologie der Platon. Dialoge der ersten Periode. Plato antwortet in den "Gesetzen" auf die Angriffe d. Aristoteles. Der Panathenaiskos d. Isokrates.] gr. 8, XVI, 310 S. Breslau. *Koebner*. n. 8.

Thiemann (Dr. C.) Grundzüge der homerischen Modus-Syntax, sowie Lehre vom Gebrauch u. Unterschied der Partikeln *ἄν* u. *κέν*. gr. 8, III, 55 S. Berlin. *Mayer & Müller*. n. 1. 50.

Thukydides, erklärt von J. Classen. 6 Bd. 6 Buch. 2 Aufl. gr. 8, XI, 216 S. Berlin. *Weidmann*. 2. 25.

Toischer (Dr. W.) Üb. die Alexandreis Ulrichs v. Eschenbach. Lex.-8. 100 S. Wien. *Gerold's Sohn in Comm.* n. 1. 50.

Trumpp (E.) Der Kampf Adams des Morgenlandes. Aethiopischer Text. 4to, XIII, 172 pp. München, 1880. *Franz*. 15 m.

Trumpp (Ernst). Grammatische Untersuchungen üb. die Sprache der Brahuis. gr. 8, 126 S. München. *Th. Ackermann*. baar n. 4.

Trumpp (Ernst). Der arabische Satzbau nach der Anschauung der arabischen Grammatiker. gr. 8, 90 S. München, 1879. *Th. Ackermann*. baar 3. 60.

Uhle (Dr. Max). Beiträge zur Grammatik e. vorklassischen Chinesisch. I. Die Partikel, 'Wéi' im Schu-King u. Schi-King. Mit (18) autogr. Schriftaf. gr. 8, X, 106 S. Leipzig. *T. O. Weigel*. n. 4.

Untersuchungen, philologische. Hrsg. v. A. Kiessling u. U. v. Wilamowitz-Moellendorff. 2 Hft.: Zu Augusteischen Dichtern. gr. 8, 122 S. Berlin. *Weidmann*. n. 2. 40. I—3.: n. 9. 40.

Vahlen (J.) Üb. die Anfänge der Heroiden d. Ovid. gr. 4, 40 S. Berlin. *Dümmler's Verl.* n. 1. 50.

Varnhagen (Hm.) Eine italienische Prosaversion der sieben Weisen. 8vo, XVI, 39 pp. Berlin, 1881. *Weidmann*. 2m.

Vogel (Frdr.) De Hegesippo, qui dicitur, Josephi interprete. gr. 8, 62 S. Erlangen. *Deichert*. n. 1. 50.

Wezel (Ernst). De opificio opificibusque apud veteres Romanos dissertatio I. 4, 32 S. Berlin. *Mayer & Müller*. baar n. 1. 20.

Wieseler (Frdr.) Scenische u. kritische Bemerkungen zu Euripides' Kyklops. gr. 4, 37 S. Göttingen. *Dieterich's Verl.* n. 2.

Wilhelmi (Wilh.) De modo irreali, qui vocatur. gr. 4, 23 S. Marburg. *Elwert's Verl.* n. 1. 20.

Wolzogen (Hans v.) Geschichte u. Gesetze der deutschen Rechtschreibung. 2 Aufl. 8, IV, 47 S. Leipzig. *Gebr. Senf.* n.n. —50.

Wüstenfeld (F.) Geschichte der Fatimiden-Chalifen. Nach arab. Quellen. Mit e. (lith.) Karten-Skizze. gr. 4, 352 S. Göttingen. *Dieterich's Verl.* n. 14.

Zühlke (Frz.) De Agaristes nuptiis. Dissert. gr. 8, 35 S. Insterburg, 1880. baar n. 1.

Zirwik (Mich.) Studien üb. griechische Wortbildung. Allgemeiner Thl. gr. 8, VI, 103 S. Würzburg. *Woerl in Comm.* n. 2.

## ITALIAN.

Fabretti (A.) Appendice al Corpus Inscriptionum Italicarum ed ai suoi supplementi, edita per cura di G. Fr. Gamurrini. 4to, VIII, 106 pp. Mit 10 Taf. Firenze, 1881. 12m. 50pf.

Millani (A. L.) Il ripostiglio della Venèra. Monete romane della seconda metà del III secolo ordinate e descritte. 4to, 213 pp. Verona, 1880. Con 3 tav.

## PORTUGUESE.

Teixeira de Aragão (A. C.) Descrição geral e istorica das moedas cunhadas em nome dos reis, regentes e governadores de Portugal. Tomo III. Mit 15 Taf. 4to, 643 pp. Lisboa, 1880. 45m.

## SPANISH.

Dominguez (R. J.) Compendio del diccionario nacional de la lengua española. 2 tomos. 8vo, XIII, 966 pp. Madrid, 1881. 10m.

## BOOKS RECEIVED.

Sophocles. Edited with English notes and introduction by Lewis Campbell, A. M., L. L. D. Vol. II. Oxford, *Clarendon Press*. New York, *Macmillan & Co.* Baltimore, *Cushings & Bailey*. \$4.

Venn (John). Symbolic Logic. Cambridge, London and New York, *Macmillan & Co.* Baltimore, *Cushings and Bailey*. \$2.75.

Figall (Andras). Ad T. Livii Librum Primum. Upsala, 1881.

Storm (Johan). Englische Philologie. Heilbronn, *Gebr. Henninger*, 1881. pp. 468. 9m.

Horstmann (C.) Altenglische Legenden. Heilbronn, *Gebr. Henninger*, 1881. pp. 536. 21m.

Französische Studien. Herausg. v. G. Körting u. E. Koschwitz. I Band, I Heft. 15m per Band v. 30 Bogen. Heilbronn, *Gebr. Henninger*. 3.75m.

Faust von Goethe. Mit Einleitung u. s. w. v. K. J. Schröer. I Theil. Heilbronn, *Gebr. Henninger*.

Pindar's Siegeslieder. Erkl. v. Friedrich Mezger. Leipzig, *B. G. Teubner*, 1880. Through *B. Westermann & Co.*, New York.

Primer of French Literature. By George Saintsbury. Oxford, *Clarendon Press*. New York, *Macmillan & Co.* Baltimore, *Cushings & Bailey*, 1880.

Ciceronis (M. T.) Pro Gnaeo Plancio Oratio. By Rev. H. H. Holden; Cambridge University Press. New York, *Macmillan & Co.*, 1881. \$1.25.

Rogers' Bird's-eye View of the English Language. New York, *L. H. Rogers*, 75 Maiden Lane. 25c.

Notes on the Nalopákyánám, or Tale of Nala. By John Peile, M. A. Cambridge, *University Press*. London and New York, *Macmillan & Co.* \$3.

Volgraff (J. C.) Greek Writers of Roman History. Some reflections upon the authorities used by Plutarch and Appianus. Leiden, *Van der Hoek Brothers*, 1880.

Abstract of the Proceedings of the Anthropological Society of Washington, 1880. Prepared by J. W. Powell.

Allgemeinheit der Sündfluth von Prof. Gustav Seyffarth, Mount Vernon, N. Y., 1881.

American College Directory. St. Louis, Mo., *C. H. Evans & Co.*, 1881.

De Arto Metrica Commodiani. Scr. Frid. Hanssen. Diss. Argentorati. 1881.

Eschyle. Morceaux choisis, publiés et annotés par Henri Weil. Paris, *Librairie Hachette*, 1881.

Siemon. Quomodo Plutarchus Thucydidem legerit. Diss. Berolini, 1881.

Propertius. Select Elegies of. Edited with introduction, notes and appendices. By J. P. Postgate, M. A. London and New York, *Macmillan & Co.*, 1881.

Roman Poets of the Republic. By W. Y. Sellar, M. A., LL. D. Oxford, *Clarendon Press*. New York, *Macmillan & Co.* Baltimore, *Cushings & Bailey*. \$3.50.

---

### EDITORIAL NOTES.

The first article in this number is preliminary to a brief series on the Revised Version of the New Testament. Professor Short was an active member of the American Committee.

---

The next number of this Journal will contain, among other articles, an essay on 'I had rather' and similar locutions, by Dr. Fitzedward Hall, and a review of Darmesteter's *Vendidad*, by Professor Luquiens.

---

The editor has received from Professor Karl Zangemeister, Chief Librarian of the University of Heidelberg, a private letter announcing the preparation of a new edition of the 'Exempla Codicum Latinorum litteris maiusculis scripta,' by Professors Zangemeister and Wattenbach, the first edition being out of print. The new edition will cost, including the supplements, 40 marks, 20 marks less than the earlier edition. There will be 65 plates fol. with text. It would seem that very few copies—the editors know of only two or three—have been disposed of in America, a contrast to the forty or fifty, which would be the proper share of this country. It is to be hoped that our Latin scholars and our great libraries will be more eager to avail themselves of the advantages of the present subscription. American scholars have been too prone to neglect palaeographical studies, and it is high time that the importance of them should be practically recognized.